INFANT-BAPTISM

No INSTITUTION

OF

CHRIST;

AND THE

Rejection of it juſtified

FROM

SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY.

In ANSWER to

Mr. *Fowler Walker*'s Book, entituled, *A Defence of INFANT-BAPTISM*, &c.

To which are annex'd,

Animadverſions on the Reverend Dr. *Thomas Ridgley*'s Diſſertation on INFANT-BAPTISM.

By DAVID REES.

John V. 39. *Search the Scriptures*, &c.

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by AARON WARD at the *King*'s *Arms* in *Little-Britain*. JOHN NOON at the *White Hart* in *Cheapſide*. H. WHITRIDGE, near the *Royal Exchange*. *and* SAMUEL ROGERS in *Abergavenny*.

MDCCXXXIV.

BRITISH MUSEUM

4325 BB58

PREFACE.

'TIS a juſt Obſervation, that the wider any People remove from papal Errors, or any other Innovations crept into the Chriſtian Church, and the nearer they approach to the Standard of naked Truth, by ſo much the more, they expoſe themſelves to the invidious Cenſures of their Neighbours; eſpecially whilſt thoſe Neighbours unhappily continue fetter'd with the long received Cuſtoms of their Anceſtors. The State of the *Proteſtant Diſſenters* in general, may ſerve to exemplify the Truth of this. And hence

hence it comes to paſs in particular, that, tho' we who aſſert *Adult-Baptiſm*, differ in nothing elſe material, from our *Proteſtant Brethren* of other Communities in this Nation, excepting in the Point of Baptiſm; yet for our attempting conſcientiouſly to reſtore this ſingle Ordinance to its original Purity, we have been, and it ſeems muſt continue to be, as, *a Sect every where ſpoken againſt.*

This Treatment is ſomewhat the more remarkable, becauſe 'tis ſo well known, that the Principle whereupon we differ from others, is ſo evidently ſupported by Scripture, that our very Adverſaries often confeſs it, and themſelves are not able to produce, any Thing like the Shape of a fair Argument againſt it.

For the *Bible*, in our *Mother-Tongue*, being now a Bleſſing granted to all, the Caſe is ſo plain, that a *Plough-Man* may read and judge of it, that *Infant-Baptiſm* is not to be found in the

the *New Teſtament*, and not only ſo, but 'tis as plain, that the baptizing of *Men* and *Women*, upon Profeſſion of Repentance, is the only Baptiſm that is to be found in the Goſpel. Accordingly we are aſſur'd, there is *one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm*. If there had been two diſtinct Sorts of Subjects, *Infants* and *Adult*, and two different ways of coming at this Ordinance, by *Sprinkling* and *Dipping*, ſurely, either our Lord, or his Apoſtles would have inform'd his Church in a Point of this Importance; and not have left future Ages, to make uncertain Conjectures, by remote and ſtrain'd Inferences, about a Goſpel-Inſtitution. And it looks very ſtrange, that we muſt be ſent back to the Covenant of Circumciſion, to know whom we are to baptize under the *New Teſtament*; as if the Commiſſion of our Lord, and the explicit Directions given us about Baptiſm itſelf, were not to be minded.

Therefore the total Silence of the Goſpel, in Regard to Pædobaptiſm, has induc'd divers conſiderable Men, to look upon it with a jealous Eye, or rather as a Thing of mere human Appointment. The great *H. Grotius* has plainly expreſs'd his Doubt as to the Place and Time of introducing Infant-Baptiſm into the Church; and he ſhrewdly ſuſpected *Africa*: His Words are theſe * "It ſeems to me, that "the Baptiſm of Infants was of old, "much more frequently practis'd in "*Africa* than in *Aſia*, and other Parts "of the World; and with a certain "Opinion of the greater Neceſſity of "it. For you don't find in any of "the Councils, a more ancient men-"tion of this Cuſtom, than in the "Council of *Carthage*.

* Videtur autem mihi antiquitus Baptiſmus Infantium, multo magis in Africa quam in Aſia aliiſve mundi partibus fuiſſe frequentatus, & cum majori quadam neceſſitatis opinione. Nam in Conciliis vetuſtiorem ejus moris mentionem, non invenias, Concilio Carthaginienſi. *Annot. in Mat.* 19. 14.

And

And a little lower, he ſays, " * *Na-*
" *zianzen* ſpeaking of them who died
" without Baptiſm, inſtances in ſuch
" as were not baptiz'd διὰ νηπιότητα,
" by Reaſon of their Infancy. And
" the ſame *Nazianzen* himſelf, tho' a
" Biſhop's Son, and a long Time
" train'd up under his Father's Care,
" was not baptiz'd till he came to
" Age, as he tells us in his own Life.
" And *John* of *Antioch*, afterwards
" called *Chryſoſtom*, born of Chriſtian
" Parents, according to the beſt Ac-
" count, and brought up by the Bi-
" ſhop *Meletius*, was baptiz'd after he
" was one and twenty Years of Age.

---

* *Nazianzenus* agens de iis qui ſine baptiſmo decedunt, exemplum ponit in iis, quibus baptiſmus non contigit διὰ νηπιότητα. Atque is ipſe *Nazianzenus*, Epiſcopi cum eſſet filius, Patris ſub cura diutiſſime educatus, baptizatus non fuit, niſi cum ex ephebis exiiſſet, ut ipſe in vitâ ſuâ nos docet. *Johannes Antiochenus* dictus poſtea *Chryſoſtomus*, parentibus natus Chriſtianis, ut verior habet ſententia, a *Meletio* Epiſcopo inſtitutus, baptizatus eſt poſt Annum primum & viceſſimum. *Ibid.*

Curcellæus deals yet more freely with us, in this Matter, and ſays, "* That Pædobaptiſm was not known "in the World, the two firſt Ages "after *Chriſt*, in the third and fourth "it was approv'd by a few, at length "in the fifth and following Ages, it "began to obtain in divers Places: "(he adds) and therefore we obſerve "this Rite indeed as an ancient "Cuſtom, but not as an Apoſtolic "Tradition.

† *Suicerus* ſpeaks much to the ſame Purpoſe, his Words are theſe; "In "the two firſt Ages no Perſon was "baptiz'd,

---

* Pædobaptiſmus —— qui duobus primis a Chriſto nato ſeculis fuit incognitus, in tertio vero & quarto a paucis eſt approbatus; in quinto demum & ſequentibus paſſim obtinere cœpit —— & proinde hic ritus a nobis quidem ut antiqua conſuetudo, ſed non ut Apoſtolica traditio, obſervatur. *Curcel. Relig. Chriſtian. Inſtit. Lib. I. C.* 12.

† Primis duobus Seculis nemo Baptiſmum accipiebat, niſi qui, in fide inſtructus, & doctrinâ Chriſti imbutus, teſtari poſſet, ſe credere: propter illa verba, *qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit* —— quia autem

" baptiz'd, 'till he was inſtructed in " the Faith, and tinctur'd with the " Doctrine of *Chriſt*, and could teſti- " fy that he believed; becauſe of thoſe " Words, *he that believeth and is* " *baptiz'd.*" And a little further, ſpeaking of the Euchariſt as given to the Adult after Baptiſm, he ſays, " It " was thought fit in like Manner to " give it to Infants, after the Intro- " duction of Infant-Baptiſm.

That excellent Hiſtorian * *Brandt* ſeems alſo to give but a doubtful Account of it, and expreſſes himſelf thus; " That good and very ancient " Cuſtom of baptizing Infants, is ad- " vanc'd with too much Violence by " ſome, and oppos'd with no leſs by " others. This Ceremony as ſome

---

autem Catechumenis adultis olim ſimul ac loti fuiſſent ſacro Baptiſmate, dabatur Euchariſtia; hoc etiam in Infantibus ut fieret inſtitutum poſt Pædobaptiſmum introductum. *Suic. Theſaur. Ecc. ſub voce* Σύναξις.

* Annot. on B. II. p. 8.

" think; prevail'd firſt in *Africa* and " *Greece*, but in ſuch a Manner that " ſome Doctors of the Church, openly " declar'd that they could not conſent " to it." —— and ſpeaking of a Canon, or Order requiring the Performance of it, he ſays, " This was firſt eſta- " bliſh'd in the Council of *Carthage*, or " the *Melevitan*, as it was called, in " the Year 418.

Now, tho' theſe great Men pliably yielded to the prevailing Cuſtoms of the Times and Countries wherein they liv'd, yet 'tis eaſy to ſee what Notion they had of Pædobaptiſm, as to the very Thing it ſelf: Again, with Reſpect to *Sprinkling*, not only the pretended Occaſion of it, and the Riſe and Progreſs thereof, are generally known, but alſo that *Dipping* was the Primitive Practice in the Chriſtian Church, is frankly acknowledg'd: I ſhall here produce two very eminent Men as Vouchers for us in this Caſe.

The *One* is the excellent *Calvin*, who

who in his *Inſtitutions*, and on the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, freely delivers himſelf thus. " * The very Word *baptizing* ſignifies to *dip*, and 'tis certain " that the *Rite* of *Dipping* was obſerv'd " in the *ancient Church*. Here we " plainly ſee what *Manner* of *bap-* " *tizing* there was among the *An-* " *cients*; for the *whole Body was* " *dipp'd into the Water*; but now the " Cuſtom has prevail'd, that the Mi- " niſter ſhould only *ſprinkle* the *Body* " or the *Head*.

The *other* is the incomparable *Grotius*, whoſe Words are theſe, " † That " this

* Quanquam & ipſum baptizandi verbum mergere ſignificat, & mergendi ritum veteri Eccleſiæ obſervatum fuiſſe conſtat. *Calv. Inſt. Llb.* 4. *Cap* 15. *Sect.* 19.

Hic perſpicimus, quiſnam apud veteres baptizandi ritus fuerit: Totum enim Corpus in aquam immergebant: nunc invaluit uſus, ut Miniſter *Corpus* vel *Caput* tantum aſpergat. *Idem. in Act. Ap. C.* 8. *v.* 38.

† Merſatione autem non perfuſione agi ſolitum hunc ritum indicat & vocis proprietas, & loca ad eum

" this *Rite* was won't to be perform'd
" by *Immerſion*, and not by *Perfu-*
" *ſion*, appears both from the Propriе-
" ty of the Word, and the Places cho-
" ſen for its Adminiſtration, *John* 3.
" 23. *Acts* 8. 38. and the many *Allu-*
" *ſions* of the *Apoſtles*, which cannot
" be referr'd to *Sprinkling*. *Rom.* 6.
" 3. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. The Cuſtom of
" *Perfuſion* or *Aſperſion*, ſeems to have
" obtain'd ſometime after in Favour
" of thoſe, who deſir'd to devote
" themſelves to Chriſt, when they *lay*
" *ſick of ſome dangerous Diſeaſe*, and
" theſe were called *Clinicks*, by other

---

eum ritum delecta, *John* III. 23. *Act.* VIII. 38. & Alluſiones multæ Apoſtolorum quæ ad Aſperſionem referri non poſſunt, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Col.* 2. 12. Serius aliquanto invaluiſſe videtur mos perfundendi ſive aſpergendi, in eorum gratiam, qui in gravi morbo cubantes nomen dare Chriſto expetebant. Quos cæteri κλινικὸς vocabant. Vide Epiſtolam *Cypriani* ad *Magnum*. Quod autem *tingere* pro *baptizare* uſurpant *Latini veteres* mirum videri non debet, cum latinè tingendi vox & propriè & plerumque idem valeat quod merſare. *H. Grot. Annot. in Matt* 3. 6.

Chriſ-

" Chriſtians. See *Cyprian*'s Epiſtle to
" *Magnus* to this Purpoſe. And it
" ought not to ſeem ſtrange, that
" the ancient *Latin Fathers* uſe *tingere*
" for *baptizare*, ſeeing the *Latin* Word
" *tingere* does properly and generally
" ſignify the ſame as *merſare* to *im-*
" *merſe* or *plunge*."

I may here alſo add, that the preſent *Rubrick* of the *Church* of *England*, in the Miniſtration of publick Baptiſm, recommends the *dipping* of the Child diſcreetly and warily. And ſome of the Reverend Clergy (Dr. *Whitby* in particular) have wiſh'd that the modern Cuſtom of *Sprinkling* were laid aſide, and that *Dipping* was reſtor'd, as in ancient Times. And the late Sir *John Floyer*, a learned Knight and eminent Phyſician, has written an excellent Treatiſe to this Purpoſe; to perſwade the eſtabliſh'd Church, if poſſible, to return and act in Conſiſtence with her own *Rubrick*.

And now, I beg leave farther to obſerve,

obſerve, that in my humble Apprehenſion of Things, Pædobaptiſm has inſenſibly uſher'd by Degrees, an incurable Diſorder into the *Chriſtian Church*; which has at Length, tranſplanted her from the *Apoſtolic* Settlement, and placed her upon a Jewiſh Foundation. This Change has been effected, by a ſtrange and groundleſs Suppoſition, that Pædobaptiſm does in ſome myſterious Manner or other, initiate Infants now into Chriſtianity, as Circumciſion did formerly introduce their Male-Children into Judaiſm; and the modern Contrivance of grounding Infant-Baptiſm, upon the oral, ſuperſtitious Tradition of the Rabbies, has not a little contributed to confirm this Matter. This Procedure has ſo alter'd the very Face of the Chriſtian Church, that ſhe no longer looks like herſelf, but wears a Jewiſh Complexion. This is undeniable, when we only compare the Conſtitution of the firſt Churches, with the preſent Poſture of Affairs.

Affairs. For under the Conduct of the Apoſtles, the Churches conſiſted of Men and Women baptiz'd on their Profeſſion of Repentance towards God, and Faith in *Chriſt*; who were immediately admitted to the Lord's Supper, and to enjoy all the Priviledges of inſtituted Worſhip, in Goſpel-Societies.

But the modern Churches conſiſt of Perſons ſprinkled in their Infancy, ſome on Pretence of their Parents Faith, others on Account of the Suretieſhip of their Sponſors. This is a very wide Variation from the original Pattern, in diſpoſing and qualifying Members for Chriſtian Communities. Sprinkling of Infants, with a Deſign, that they ſhould paſs in due Time, for regularly baptiz'd Chriſtians, was a Thing unheard of in the Apoſtles Days, and for many Ages after them. The plain Queſtion then is, how ſo bold an Alteration can be warranted, without the leaſt Intimation of Licence from the Law-Giver? and 'tis much to be doubted,

obſerve, that in my humble Apprehenſion of Things, Pædobaptiſm has inſenſibly uſher'd by Degrees, an incurable Diſorder into the *Chriſtian Church*; which has at Length, tranſplanted her from the *Apoſtolic* Settlement, and placed her upon a Jewiſh Foundation. This Change has been effected, by a ſtrange and groundleſs Suppoſition, that Pædobaptiſm does in ſome myſterious Manner or other, initiate Infants now into Chriſtianity, as Circumciſion did formerly introduce their Male-Children into Judaiſm; and the modern Contrivance of grounding Infant-Baptiſm, upon the oral, ſuperſtitious Tradition of the Rabbies, has not a little contributed to confirm this Matter. This Procedure has ſo alter'd the very Face of the Chriſtian Church, that ſhe no longer looks like herſelf, but wears a Jewiſh Complexion. This is undeniable, when we only compare the Conſtitution of the firſt Churches, with the preſent Poſture of Affairs.

Affairs. For under the Conduct of the Apoſtles, the Churches conſiſted of Men and Women baptiz'd on their Profeſſion of Repentance towards God, and Faith in *Chriſt*; who were immediately admitted to the Lord's Supper, and to enjoy all the Priviledges of inſtituted Worſhip, in Goſpel-Societies.

But the modern Churches conſiſt of Perſons ſprinkled in their Infancy, ſome on Pretence of their Parents Faith, others on Account of the Suretieſhip of their Sponſors. This is a very wide Variation from the original Pattern, in diſpoſing and qualifying Members for Chriſtian Communities. Sprinkling of Infants, with a Deſign, that they ſhould paſs in due Time, for regularly baptiz'd Chriſtians, was a Thing unheard of in the Apoſtles Days, and for many Ages after them. The plain Queſtion then is, how ſo bold an Alteration can be warranted, without the leaſt Intimation of Licence from the Law-Giver? and 'tis much to be doubted,

doubted, whether *Chriſt* ever deſign'd, that his Church ſhould run in this new Channel, quite different from any Thing, he had mark'd out in his written Word.

This, thro' the Prevalence of Cuſtom, is implicitly taken for granted, whereas, 'tis the very Point, which ſhould be well examin'd and prov'd. But the modern Conduct is very remarkable; for ſome Gentlemen aſſert, that their Infants are born and baptiz'd into Covenant Relation to God and his Church, yet even then, there is no Church that claims them as Members; nor are they treated as ſuch: Therefore as they grow up, they do as they liſt, as having never been received within the Boundary of any Communion. there is no eccleſiaſtical Reſtraint can be laid upon them. tho' they were enter'd into Covenant, as ſome call it, by Baptiſm, yet are they Chriſtians at large, who belong to no particular Flock of Chriſt. And 'tis reaſonable to judge,

judge, that it was this Inconvenience among other things, that induc'd the *African* Fathers to give them the Euchariſt, and to admit them into full Communion at once. And herein it muſt be own'd, they acted conſiſtent with themſelves, which the preſent Pædobaptiſts do not.

On the other hand, in Adult Baptiſm, the Parties profeſs to come out of a ſinful World, and teſtify their Reſolution to ſubmit to the ordinances of Chriſt; which having done, and not till then, they are receiv'd into Chriſtian Commnion. if they afterwards act unworthy of their Profeſſion, the very Door that let them in, will ſerve to let them out at; in which State, they are accounted by our Lord and his Church, as *Heathen-Men*, till they repent and return. And I am well ſatisfied, that this comes neareſt the Plat-form of Order recorded in the Goſpel: for we read of being baptiz'd, *and then added to the Church, and*

conti-

continuing ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and Fellowſhip, and in Breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. Acts. 2. 41. 42. we read likewiſe, of *putting away from among them, unclean Perſons,* 1 Cor. 5. 13.

And upon all theſe Conſiderations, I may juſtly alledge, that Adult Baptiſm is built upon a Foundation, as much preferable to that of Pædobaptiſm, as Scripture-Authority is above an unwritten Tradition.

ERRATA.

PAGE 23. Line 8. read *found.* P. 31. L. 20. r. *underſtand.* P. 44. L. 9. r. *favourite.* P. 157. at bottom, r. τόυτο. P. 172. r. *ſufferings.*

THE

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

REmarks on Mr. Walker's *unfair Account of the Commiſſion, with a Vindication of the true Import of it.* pag. 1------5. *Teſtimonies of Dr.* Hammond *produc'd and examin'd,* p. 6, 7. *Of the Engliſh* Rubrick *Ibid. Of Dr.* Whitby, p. 8, 9. *The Argument from Jewiſh Baptiſm conſider'd,* p. 17 ------ 29. *The Origin of the* Miſhna *and* Talmuds, *according to* Buxtorf *and Dr.* Bray, p. 22.

CHAP. II.

Acts 2. 38, 39. *conſider'd,* p. 30——33. *Conceſſions of Dr.* Hammond *and Dr.* Whitby, *Ibid. The Baptiſm of whole Houſholds examin'd, and the Inſtances produc'd, inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm,* p. 34——40.

CHAP. III.

The Argument from the Covenant examin'd, with a plain and conciſe Definition of the Covenant of Grace, p. 41——47. *The Sentiments of the firſt* Reformers, *of the Church of* England, *of the* Aſſembly *at* Weſtminſter, *of Biſhop* Carleton, *about it,* p. 48——50. *Divers Queries relating to it reſolv'd,* p. 51——62. *Circumciſion no Seal of this Covenant to the* Jews, p. 63--65. *Baptiſm no Seal of it to Chriſtians,* p. 66. G. Na-

zianzen's *Notion of it*, p. 67. *The Sentiments of divers great Men about it, collected by Mr.* Tombes, p. 68. *Several Objections of Pædobaptiſts anſwer'd*, p. 70——78.

CHAP. IV.

The Baptiſm of the Iſraelites *in their Paſſage through the Red Sea conſider'd*, p. 80——83. *Chriſt receiving Children into his Arms, and bleſſing them* Mark 10, *and* Matt. 19. *no Ground for baptizing Infants*, p. 85. *The Cutting off the Jews, and ingrafting the Gentiles on the Stock of* Abraham, *explain'd and vindicated from the falſe Gloſſes of divers Pædobaptiſts*, p. 86——88. *A tranſient View of Women's* Right *to the Lord's Supper, of the* Obſervance *of the* firſt *Day of the* Week, p. 92, 93.

CHAP. V.

More Objections as propos'd by Mr. W. *conſider'd, his Reaſons againſt* John's *Baptiſm of no Weight*, p. 98, 99. *The ſuppos'd Rebaptization* Acts, 19. *with the Arguments* pro *and* con. *ſtated, and left to the Reader's Judgment*, p. 100. Cyprian *and many others of his Time for* Anabaptiſm, *but did not like the* Term, p. 101. *The* Dutch Annotators, Wollebius, *&c. againſt Rebaptization, in* Acts 19. p. 102——104. *Teſtimony of* Tertullian *about the Eunuch's Baptiſm*, p. 108. Cyprian *gave the Lord's Supper to Infants*, p. 110. *Paſſages of Dr.* Gale's *vindicated*, p. 115——120.

CHAP. VI.

Lexicographers favour Dipping, p. 121. *Some Jewiſh Lotions conſider'd*, p. 123. *The Land of* Canaan

Canaan *did not want Water*, p. 125. *The ancient Way of Burying among the Jews, with a Teſtimony of* Caſaubon, p. 133. *A Citation out of Sir* Norton Knatchbull, p. 138. *Sprinkling or pouring gave Offence in* Cyprian's *Time*, p. 146.

CHAP. VII.

Mr. W's *Reaſons for* Sprinkling, *and againſt* Dipping, *frivolous and uncharitable*, p. 147, 148. *His Teſtimonies from Antiquity ſpurious, or of no Weight*, p. 150——155. *The two firſt Centuries declare for Adult-Baptiſm, particularly, St.* Barnabas, Hermas, Juſtin Martyr *and* Tertullian.

CHAP. VIII.

Baptiſteries, *with Fonts in them for Dipping, erected in ancient Times*, p. 174. *The Teſtimony of St.* Ambroſe, *as to the Figure of the Font. Citations out of Mr.* Bingham, *to this Purpoſe*, Ibid. *Our preſent Practice reſembles the ancient Order*, p. 177. *Divers Teſtimonies againſt Infant-Baptiſm before the Time of* Luther *and* Calvin, p. 181-----201. *The Date of the Appearance of* Luther, Zuinglius, *and the foreign* Baptiſts, Ibid. *The firſt Riſe of ſeveral Denominations in* England, *p.* 184. *Teſtimony of Mr.* Neal Ibid. *Of Mr.* Brandt, *Ibid. Of Capt.* Dean, p. 186. *Of the* Churches *of* Piedmont, *and the Riſe of the* Waldenſes, p. 188. *Teſtimony of Dr.* Allix, *and of* Beza *concerning their Antiquity*, p. 189. *Some Hints of* Berengarius *and* Arnoldus Brixienſis, p. 192. *Some of the* Waldenſes *driven into* Bohemia, p. 191——200. *A brief Narrative of the Sufferings of ſome foreign Anabaptiſts*, p. 207——220.

The CONTENTS.

ANimadverſions on the Reverend Dr. Thomas Ridgley's *Diſcourſe of Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 223. *The Foundation of that Doctrine examin'd*, p. 224-----227 *Children of Infidels baptiz'd in* Auſtin's *Time*, p. 228. *No Warrant from Scripture to dedicate any Infants by Baptiſm*, Ibid. *The Argument from the* Abrahamic *Covenant reſum'd*, p. 233. *Natural Seed of ordinary* Gentile *Believers, no Children of the Promiſe in the Senſe of the Goſpel*, p. 235——237. *The Doctrine of* federal Holineſs *examin'd, at large*, p. 238——248. *Conſiderations on the Baptiſm in the Red-Sea reſum'd*, p. 250. *Teſtimonies of Dr.* Lightfoot *examin'd*, p. 254. *A pretended* Piece *under the Name of* Juſtin Martyr, *rejected*, p. 257. *A Teſtimony of* Irenæus *very precarious*, p. 258. G. Nazianzen *a partial Pædobaptiſt*, p. 261. *The* Aſſembly *of* Divines *allow'd* Dipping, p. 262. *Reflections on the Reverend Dr.* Owen's *Critical Obſervations on Dipping*, p. 263——274. *Teſtimonies and Citations from Dr.* Gale, *Ibid. Divers Objections of Dr.* Ridgley's *conſider'd. The Ancients diveſted in Order to be baptiz'd*, p. 284. *Teſtimonies of Dr.* Tillotſon, *and Dr.* Burnet, p. 285. *Of Mr.* Bingham, *with Citations from* Cyril *of* Jeruſalem, Amphilochius, *&c.* p. 286. *The ancient Order of* Deaconeſſes *uſeful at the Baptiſm of Women*, p. 287. *The Concluſion, with the Teſtimony of Dr.* Whitby.

INFANT-

Infant-Baptiſm No Inſtitution of CHRIST, &c.

CHAP. I.

Remarks on Mr. Walker's *unfair Account of the Commiſſion,* Matt. 28. *No Infants can be concerned in it, according to the plain Purport of it. The Argument from Jewiſh Baptiſm conſider'd. Rabbinical Teſtimonies of a fabulous Original, and too precarious to be depended upon in this Controverſy.*

MR. *Walker* begins the Argumentative Part of his Book in p. 8. His Words are theſe, *It is commonly ſaid, they* (meaning *the Pædobaptiſts*) *have neither Command, Example, nor good Scripture-Conſequence to ſupport their Practice. But I hope to make it appear to the unprejudic'd Hearer, that we have all three,* viz. *Scripture-Precepts, Precedent and good Conſequence.*

I. *As to a Command for the Baptiſm of Infants, I apprehend the original Command relating to Baptiſm in general, contains in it a Command for the baptizing of Infants: This we have* Matt. 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Mr. *W.* proceeds directly, to make his Obſervation on the Words, and on the Deſign and Purport of the Commiſſion, in the following Manner: *In which Words we have Chriſt's Command to his Diſciples, and in them to ſucceeding Miniſters, to go and baptize all Nations.*

I would only deſire the honeſt Reader in this Place, to take Notice of this *Obſervation*, that at his firſt ſetting out, he mutilates and tranſpoſes the Words of the Commiſſion, in order to pervert the Meaning of them. He ſays, *that Chriſt gave Command to his Diſciples, and in them to ſucceeding Miniſters to go and baptize all Nations*, whereas the Text ſays, *go and teach all Nations*, &c. Here, in the Obſervation, the Word *teach* is ſtruck out, and the Word *baptize* put in the Room of it, on purpoſe to let his Reader know, that *Baptiſm* ought to go before any *Teaching*. This is no leſs in plain Terms, than an Attempt to perſwade the World, that our *Lord* did not expreſs his Meaning aright to his Diſciples, therefore Mr. *W.* takes upon him to correct the Diſorder and Inaccuracy of the *Commiſſion*, and to put it in a proper Light. 'Tis evident that I do not in the leaſt wrong Mr. *W.* when

when I charge him with this violent Diſtortion of Scripture, for 'tis his main Drift in this Place, to prove that *Baptizing* is the *firſt Act* of *Diſcipling*, and that *Teaching* is only a *ſubſequent Act*.

He had a Point in View, that he could not carry without it. P. 10. his Words are theſe, *That nothing can be concluded againſt Infants Right to Baptiſm, from Teaching being put before Baptiſm, is to me plain, from* Mark 1. 4. *where we are told, that* John *baptized and preached, where Baptiſm is put before Preaching, and according to this way of arguing, muſt go before it.*

Here, we have the true Reaſon, why Mr. *W.* could not endure the Words of the Commiſſion, in the Order and Contexture that our Lord ſpoke them, the Word *teach* being put before *baptizing*, ſtood as a Bar in his way, and he did not know what to do with it, and therefore would venture to remove it, at all Hazards, to make room for *Infant-Baptiſm*; for to take the Words in the clear Connection, in which they were deliver'd, they made quite againſt his profeſs'd Deſign. Some Art then muſt be uſed, to new model them, before they could be rendred ſubſervient to the Cauſe he pleads for; therefore a new Tranſlation of them is judged neceſſary, to favour this End. P. 9. *As to the common Objection* (ſays he) *againſt this Proof for Infant-baptiſm, that the Text requires teaching before baptizing, I muſt own that in Order of Words, according to our Tranſlation teach is put before baptize, but then wou'd obſerve with Dr.* Hammond, *Dr.* Whitby, *Mr.* Sydenham, *Mr.* Hall,

&c. *that the Text might as well have been rendred, go and diſciple all Nations, Baptiſm being appointed as the Way by which Diſciples are to be entred into the Chriſtian Church.*

Here it may be very proper to ask Mr. *W.* ſome plain Queſtions, as

I. What Advantage has he gain'd, by joining with theſe learned Gentlemen, to alter our preſent Tranſlation: has he been able to invert the Order of the Greek Words in the Commiſſion, and to put the Word *baptizing* before *Diſcipling?* Or has he found that the Word μαθητεύσατε ſignifies to make Diſciples any other way than by teaching? Are not the Words *Teacher* and *Diſciple* relative Terms? Does he know of any Method of diſcipling People but by inſtructing of them? Does the Word *diſcipling* exclude *teaching*, or was there ever a *Diſciple*, but who was taught in ſome Art or Science, or Point of Knowledge, by ſome Teacher or other? This *new* Tranſlation makes for the *Baptiſts*, and they chooſe it rather than the *old* one, for the Word μαθητεύσατε ſignifies not only to *teach*, but to teach to *Purpoſe*, ſo as to make a *Diſciple* of the *Perſon* taught, and to form him in the Opinion and Sentiments of his *Teacher*.

II. I would ask in Conſequence of this, does Mr. *W.* believe in his own Conſcience, that immediate Baptizing was the firſt Act that the Apoſtles were charg'd with, *excluſive* of, and *antecedent* to all Teaching? Was there intended no previous *Notice*, or Inſtruction to be given to the

the People, which might be called *Teeching* or *Preaching?* Were theſe Perſons of *all Nations* to be taken by the Head and Shoulders, and to be baptized without any thing ſaid to them?

Were they forthwith to be admitted in their idolatrous and heatheniſh Ignorance, void of all Knowledge of the *true God*, and *Jeſus Chriſt his Son*, into whoſe Religion they were to be initiated and diſcipled? It can't enter into my Thoughts that Mr. *W.* or any other Pædobaptiſt, upon mature deliberation, can believe theſe things. But as abſurd and ridiculous, as this Doctrine appears to be, he is obliged to try all the Skill he is Maſter of, to defend it. 'Tis abſolutely neceſſary for him, to make uſe of this way of arguing; for without inverting the Order of the Words, or deſtroying the natural Meaning of them, he can never pretend to bring Infants within the Compaſs of this Commiſſion, to be baptized; for the Words of our *Lord* ſtand clearly and ſtrongly connected, in two Evangeliſts.

Matt. 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt.*

Mark 16. 15, 16. *And he ſaid unto them, go ye into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature. He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.*

I confeſs, I am ſomewhat amaz'd that any proteſtant Miniſter, while theſe Scriptures ſtare him full in the Face, ſhould attempt to perſwade his Congregation from the Pulpit, and the World from the Preſs, that our Lord Chriſt requir'd

Baptiſm before any Manner of Teaching in the Words of this Commiſſion: But I know that 'tis no new Path of Mr. *W*'s beating out; for others labouring under the ſame Diſadvantages, have attempted this Way before him, particularly Dr *Hammond*; but then this great Man has unhappily contradicted himſelf, in ſpeaking of this Inſtance of the Commiſſion. For in the * Queries, he employs all his skill to perſwade us, *that there is no previous Inſtruction required to baptizing, and that* μαθητεύσατε *and* βαπτίζοντες *to make diſciples and baptize, is all one.*

But in his Paraphraſe upon the Commiſſion, and elſewhere, he is quite of another Opinion: You may conſult him on the following Places. Matt. 28. 19. where he ſays thus, *teach all the Nations, the Chriſtian Doctrine, and perſwade them to embrace it, and to live according to it, baptizing*, &c.

And upon the parallel Commiſſion in *Mark* 16. 16. he ſays thus, *he that receives the Goſpel as preached by you, and thereupon becomes a Proſelyte or Diſciple of Chriſt, and deſires and receives Baptiſm*, &c.

Again paraphraſing on the Words of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 38. he ſays, *Peter anſwered them, that there was now but one poſſible way left; that was, with true Contrition and Acknowledgement of their Sin, to haſten out of this Infidelity, and to receive Baptiſm from the Apoſtles.*

---

* Queries p. 196, 197.

But

But he is notoriouſly plain, in his Diſſertations on Epiſcopacy, where he enlarges on the Commiſſion, thus,* *Call all Nations to Diſcipleſhip, or inſtruct them in the Faith and Diſcipline, teſtify the Reſurrection of Chriſt to all, and by preaching the Goſpel in all Parts, gather Diſciples, and having gathered them, baptize and teach them.*

So that the Caſe is evident, that when Dr. *Hammond* had Infant baptiſm in view, the Commiſſion *Matt.* 28. puzzled him; but when he acted the Part of an impartial Expoſitor, he could without Heſitation, give a fair Account of the Commiſſion.

Beſides, 'tis to be obſerved, that this Learned Gentleman in this Point, went directly contrary to the fundamental Order of the *Church of England.* For in the Miniſtration of Baptiſm, to ſuch as are of riper Years, and able to anſwer for themſelves, we find theſe words, *viz.* † *When any ſuch Perſons as are of riper Years, are to be baptiz'd, timely Notice ſhall be given to the Biſhop, or whom he ſhall appoint for that Purpoſe,* —— *that ſo due Care may be taken for their Examination, whether they be ſufficiently inſtructed in the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, and that they may be exhorted to prepare themſelves with Prayers and Faſtings, for the receiving this Holy Sacrament; and if they ſhall be found fit,* &c.

---

* Ad Diſcipulatum vocate, vel diſciplina & fide imbuite Gentes omnes, Reſurrectionem Chriſti omnibus teſtatam facite, & Evangelio per omnes Oras enunciato, Diſcipulos congregate, Congregatos βαπτίζοντες & διδάσκοντες. Diſſert. 3. Cap. 4 §. 1.

† See Miniſtration of Baptiſm in Common-Prayer.

Hence 'tis undeniable that the *Church of England* is againſt baptizing adult Perſons blind-fold, without having them firſt inſtructed, and prepared for this ſolemn Inſtitution. But what ſeems moſt odd and inconſiſtent in Mr. *W*'s Conduct, is, that the *Aſſembly's Catechiſm* does not approve, of baptizing any out the viſible Church, till they make Profeſſion of Faith. The Words are theſe. Q. 95. *To whom is Baptiſm to be adminiſtred?* Anſ. *Baptiſm is not to be adminiſtred to any, that are out of the viſible Church, 'till they profeſs their Faith in Chriſt and Obedience to him*, &c. This is the Catechiſm, that Mr. *W*. profeſſes to believe and teach, and the very Catechiſm that gave Riſe to his late Book, and yet he is not of the Opinion, of the Compilers of it. He is for baptizing all at Random, without any previous Inſtruction: the Authors of this Catechiſm, were for waiting 'till the Adult made a Profeſſion of Faith in Chriſt, and Obedience to him.

But Mr. *W*. does the higheſt Injuſtice to Dr. *Whitby*, when he endeavours to lug him in, to ſupport his own abſurd Notion of the Commiſſion; for that Learned Author has cut down at once, all that Mr. *W*. has been attempting to build up, in his prepoſterous Account of the Commiſſion. Dr. *Whitby*'s Words on *Matt*. 28. *ver*. 19. are theſe. " Μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *teach all* " *Nations.* Μαθητεύειν *here is to preach the* " *Goſpel to all Nations, and to engage them to be-* " *lieve it, in order to their Profeſſion of that Faith* " *by Baptiſm; as ſeems apparent* (1) *from the* " *Parallel Commiſſion* Mark 16. 15. *go preach* " *the*

" *the Gospel to every Creature, he that believeth,*
" *and is baptized, shall be Saved.* (2) *from the*
" *Scripture-Notion of a Disciple, that being still*
" *the same as a Believer.* And a little lower the
" same Author adds, *if here it should be said,*
" *that I yield too much to the Antipædobaptists,*
" *by saying, that to be made Disciples here, is to*
" *be taught to believe in Christ, that so they might*
" *be his Disciples; I desire any one to tell me, how*
" *the Apostles could,* μαθητευειν *make a Disciple*
" *of an Heathen, or unbelieving Jew, without be-*
" *ing* Μαθηται *or Teachers of them; whether*
" *they were not sent to preach to those that could*
" *hear, and to teach them to whom they preached,*
" *that Jesus was the Christ, and only to baptize*
" *them, when they did believe this. This is so ab-*
" *solutely necessary in the Nature of the thing, till*
" *a Christian Church among the Heathens, or the*
" *Jews was founded, and so expressly said by*
" Justin Martyr, *to have been the Practice in the*
" *first Ages of the Church, that to deny what is con-*
" *firm'd, by such Evidence of Reason and Church-*
" *History, would be to prejudice a Cause, which*
" *in my poor judgment, needs not this Interpreta-*
" *tion of the word* μαθητευειν, *nor needs it be as-*
" *serted that Infants are made Disciples, any*
" *more than that they are made Believers by Bap-*
" *tism,* &c." Now, the most favourable Construction that I can put on Mr. *W*'s Management in this Affair, is that he either never read Dr. *Whitby* on the Commission, or that he never consider'd him, as he should; for otherwise, he would never have offer'd so grosly to impose upon

upon his Reader, and ſo ſhamefully to abuſe his Author, as to endeavour to make Dr. *Whitby* a Party, in promoting the baptizing of all Nations, before they were inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion, and all this upon the Authority of the Commiſſion of our Lord. The very Attempt is ſhocking.

But, that I may do Mr. *W.* and his Argument upon this Head all the juſtice I can, I ſhall go back again to his own Words, tho' expreſs'd in an ambiguous Manner. *p.* 8. they are theſe, *the Subjects of Baptiſm are to be all the Inhabitants of a Nation embracing Chriſtianity* As this Propoſition is laid down here, 'twill be a difficult thing to prove it true, in any ſenſe he can be willing to put upon it; for,

I. If he means (by *all*) that every Individual in a Nation, muſt embrace Chriſtianity, before he be baptiz'd, Mr. *W.* muſt wait, till theſe Infants have embraced Chriſtianity, with the other Inhabitants, or elſe they are neceſſarily excluded Baptiſm, even by his own Propoſition.

II. If he intends (by *all*) as I believe he does, that where a Nation in general profeſſes Chriſtianity, it entitles every Individual of ſuch a Nation to Baptiſm. How will the Truth of this appear? Is Mr. *W.* for baptizing the Many thouſands of *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Indians*, that are in this Nation, before they are converted to Chriſtianity? And beſides we have among us, in this Nation, great Numbers of Idiots, Lunaticks, and raving Madmen; ſuppoſing theſe not baptized in their

their Infancy, are they immediately to be admitted to Baptiſm? Then they muſt of Courſe be received to the Lord's Supper. Again, there are vaſt Numbers of profligate Wretches, who live and glory in the moſt ſcandalous Crimes, as common Drunkenneſs, dreadful Oaths and Curſes, Lying, Theft, and Whoredom, are theſe fit Subjects for Baptiſm, while in ſuch a State? I am ſure *John the Baptiſt* rejected ſuch with Abhorrence, and ſo will every conſcientious Miniſter ſend 'em back as a Generation of Vipers, 'till they bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance. Nor can I ſee upon what ground Mr. *W.* would adminiſter Baptiſm to the Infants of theſe People: certainly he would not offer to do it on the Account of their Parents Faith; and I am well ſatisfied, that the Commiſſion of our Lord never intended, that theſe miſerable Creatures whether Parents or Infants, ſhould be made Partakers of the holy Inſtitution of Baptiſm, while in theſe Circumſtances.

Where does this Doctrine tend, but to bring a Deluge of Debauchery into the Churches of Chriſt? And to make more Deiſts and Infidels among us, and to encourage the graceleſs Herd of Mankind to conclude, that there is nothing in the Ordinances of Chriſtianity, nor are any Qualifications requir'd in thoſe, who come to partake of them.

To what purpoſe then does Mr. *W.* tell us in the ſame page, *that the Command is general and includes Particulars?* This ſort of Logic will make wretched Divinity, for at this Rate, he

makes

makes no Diſtinction between the Righteous and the Wicked, between the Penitent and Outrageous daring Sinners, between thoſe, who humbly deſire to come to the Ordinances of God, and ſuch, who by the juſt Laws of the Land, ought to be ſent forthwith to the Houſe of Correction.

Mr. *W.* has thought fit to give us another Text, *viz. Geneſis* 12. 18. to let us know, that Infants are included in the word *Nations*; who ever deny'd this, but they are a Part of a Nation? However, I deny, that Infants are capable of being taught in any Nation; this is what he muſt prove, or he does Nothing. Infants, as well as others being untaught the Knowledge of Chriſt, have no claim to Baptiſm, according to the plain Intent of this Commiſſion.

We have in the next Place, a nice Obſervation of Mr. *W*'s, i. e. *it is well known, that Laws are moſt commonly deliver'd in general Terms, and to be interpreted in the moſt extenſive Senſe*; I confeſs, I differ from him, and am of the contrary Opinion; for Laws, eſpecially God's poſitive Laws, are deliver'd in very particular, diſtinct Terms, that there might be no Room to miſtake his Meaning. We may ſee clear Inſtances, as in the Building of the Tabernacle; all the Materials and Utenſils are reckon'd up particularly, as Boards, Bars, Pillars, Sockets, Staves, Tables, Candleſticks, Lamps, Hooks, Chapiters, Rings and Pins, *&c.* The expreſs Direction was from the Lord, they were not to vary from his Order. And therefore we read *Exod.* 39. 43.

That

That Moſes *did look upon all the Work, and behold they had done it, as the Lord had Commanded.* Again if we take the Caſe of Circumciſion, the Command was given to *Abraham* in ſuch plain Terms, that he could not eaſily miſunderſtand them.

The Fleſh of the Fore-ſkin was to be cut off, of all the Male-children, of all born in his Houſe, or bought with his Money, and this to be done preciſely on the eighth Day after their Birth, throughout their Generations; for my Part, I can't ſee, what poſſible Miſtake there could happen in ſo plain a Caſe as this. The Point of Baptiſm, is as clear every Whit, were it not for the cunning and ſubtile Diſputations of learned Men.

Are not the Words of the Commiſſion deliver'd in the moſt unexceptionable Terms? *Go ye and teach all Nations baptizing them, and as many as believe and are baptized ſhall be ſaved.*

Does it not appear from hence, that 'tis the firſt Buſineſs of Miniſters, to inform the Minds of Men and Women, as to the Knowledge of God and Chriſt, and upon their Conviction, and Reception of the Chriſtian Faith, then to baptize them? What occaſion is there to raiſe unneceſſary Duſt, to darken and deſtroy the plain and natural Meaning of this Commiſſion?

But I ſhall offer the following Conſiderations, farther to evince if poſſible, that the Commiſſion to baptize was intended only for thoſe who are taught, or made Diſciples before hand, and not for any others, and conſequently that Infants are not concern'd in it.

I. The

I. The Words of the Commiſſion take no Notice of two ſorts of Subjects to be baptized, the one taught, the other untaught, if there had been ſuch a Diſtinction found out, that the Adult were to be taught firſt, and baptized afterwards; but that Infants were to be baptized without any more adoe, then the Diſpute would be at an End. But the Subjects ſpoken of here, are of one Sort: Therefore to pretend to introduce any others, is not only begging of the Queſtion in Debate, but a direct Violation of the Commiſſion.

II. According to Mr. *W*'s Argument, None at all are to be taught, for if Infants may be baptized without Inſtruction, ſo may the Adult by the ſame Rule. And then the Word μαθητεύσατε may be thrown out and laid aſide, as uſeleſs, and ſo the matter ſhould run thus, *go and baptize all Nations*, in the midſt of their Idolatry and Wickedneſs; and teach them afterward on ſome proper Seaſons; but what a dreadful Idea does this Interpretation give us of our Lord's Commiſſion!

III. The ſecondary teaching, or that ſubſequent to Baptiſm, Διδάσκοντες αὐτὸς, cannot be underſtood in any good ſenſe, nor in the Nature of things, as referring to Infants; for they (Infants) could not be preſently taught, and if the Apoſtles were order'd to wait, 'till they came to Years of Diſcretion, then they ceaſed to be Infants, of 5 or 6 Days old, or in the Senſe that the Pædobaptiſts plead for. Therefore whether we conſider the Inſtruction contain'd in μαθητεύσατε preceeding Baptiſm, or the Teaching comprehended in διδάσκοντες αὐτὸς ſucceeding it, Infants can

can have no claim in the one, nor in the other, upon any pretence whatſoever.

IV. Here is, not only, an abſolute total Silence as to Infants, but a ſtrong Prohibition of baptizing any adult Perſons who are untaught, or quite ignorant of Chriſtianity. And if the expreſs Order from our Lord's Mouth, was, to teach People firſt, who would venture to contradict it, and to act Counter to it, by baptizing any before they were taught? All poſitive Laws, always carry their Negative in them, and along with them. If the Command be given to perform ſuch an Action, and directing to the Manner of Performance, 'tis plain that omitting that Action, or varying in the Manner of performing it, is a Breach of that Command. When God order'd *Abraham* to circumciſe all the Males on the eighth Day, there was no Need of forbidding him to meddle with the Females, nor to forbid him to do it, on the ſeventh or ninth Day; the poſitive explicit Command was a ſufficient Direction in that Matter. The Application is eaſy in the Caſe of Baptiſm; if our Lord has given Commiſſion, firſt to teach, and then baptize, there is no need to forbid us, to baptize ſuch who were never taught; much leſs is there any Need to forbid the baptizing of Infants, who are not only untaught, but incapable of being taught, at all. So that there is nothing more foreign to the Purpoſe of this Commiſſion, and nothing leſs probable to be contain'd in it, than Infant-baptiſm.

Therefore what Mr. *W.* advances *p.* 9. is weak and frivilous, when He tells us, *that theſe Words*

of

of our Lord were ſpoken to Perſons who had been taught to look upon Children in Covenant, upon the Account of their Parents, and had always ſeen the Seal of the Covenant applied to 'em, as well as their Parents, and would be likely to do the ſame, unleſs forbid. He repreſents theſe Diſciples ſent forth by our Lord, as a ſtrange ſelf-willed ſort of People, what! could they not underſtand the Meſſage deliver'd to 'em, or could they not be reclaim'd from the old Tract of Circumciſion, to practice any other way? the new Commiſſion given them, was plain enough, one would have thought, they were ſent to teach the Nations the Knowledge of Chriſt, and to baptize thoſe who were thus taught. I can't apprehend any great difficulty, in taking in the Meaning of our Lord in this Affair. And we have all the Reaſon in the World, to believe, that the Diſciples readily underſtood the Commiſſion, and apply'd themſelves cloſe to the Execution of it. For in the Account that the new Teſtament gives us, of the Travels and Actions of the Apoſtles, we find that Multitudes, yea many thouſands of Men and Women were baptized by them, but no mention in the leaſt made of Infants. Nor will any impartial Reader of the New Teſtament wonder at this; for as there was nothing about Infants, in the Commiſſion, ſo we can't expect to hear any thing of them, in the Account of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, in the Apoſtolic Church.

But Mr. *W.* repreſents in the ſame page, that *the Diſciples would be much inclin'd to give Baptiſm to Infants, ſince they had been accuſtom'd to*

ſee

ſee them received into the Church, and even baptiz'd. So that he now retreats to the laſt Refuge, that ſome Pædobaptiſts have to defend Infant-Baptiſm, and that is by urging, *that the Jews us'd Baptiſm, in receiving Members into their Church, and eſpecially when they received any Proſelytes who were of Age, they baptiz'd them and their Infants.* And conſequently from this Jewiſh Cuſtom, our *Lord* borrowed the *Ordinance* of Baptiſm. I muſt confeſs, that I can't well digeſt this odd Scheme, and therefore ſhall be oblig'd to give it a more particular Examination.

The Authorities produc'd by Mr. *W.* to prove this to have been an uſage among the *Jews*, are theſe following, *viz.* " Dr. Hammond *tells us* " *from* Maimonides, *that by three things the Iſra-* " *elites entred into the Covenant, by Circumciſion,* " *Baptiſm and Sacrifice ----- He tells us too, that* " *it was the Cuſtom of the Jews, not only to bap-* " *tize ſuch of their Proſelytes as were of Age, but* " *alſo their Children, for proof of which he quotes* " *Gema. Babylon, which ſays they baptize the little* " *or young Stranger, or Proſelyte*; *and* Maimon. " *who ſays they baptize the Infant or little Strang-* " *er, upon the Knowledge or Uunderſtanding of the* " *Houſe of Judgment, or the Congregation*, i. e. " *on their Deſire in the Behalf of the Children*, &c. " *Dr.* Ham. 6 *Queries* p. 180. 188. *We have more of this Buſineſs, for Dr.* Ham. *quotes* Rabbi Joſhua *who ſaid*," *We find of our Mothers that* " *they were baptized, and not circumciſed; and* " Maimonides *who ſays in all Ages whenſoever*

" *any Gentile was willing to enter into the Cove-*
" *nant, he was bound to have Circumciſion, Bap-*
" *tiſm, and a Peace-offering; and if it were a*
" *Woman, Baptiſm and Sacrifice. Dr.* Ham. ibid. p. 185. 184.

I have now laid before the Reader, the Ground upon which Mr. *W.* goes in proving Infant-baptiſm among the *Jews*, before the coming of Chriſt. I ſhall therefore proceed directly to ſhew the Vanity and Fallaciouſneſs of this way of arguing.

I. If the *Jews* uſed Baptiſm under the Law, before the Days of our Saviour, it was not of God's Appointment, 'tis neither commanded in the Law of *Moſes*, nor recommended in any Part of the Old Teſtament; there is not ſo much as the Shadow of it, to be found in thoſe ſacred Writings, as an Ordinance of God.

II. If it was not of God, whenſoever, and by whomſoever this Cuſtom was brought in, 'twas the Invention of Men, and then much good may it do Mr. *W.* and ſome Pædobaptiſts to build Infant-baptiſm upon the voluntary, but ſinfull Innovation of Men. They have brought the poor Babes to a fair Paſs, and their Cauſe to a fine Condition: For Infant-baptiſm, it ſeems, ſo frequently and ſo fondly called the *Seal* of the Covenant, is *nothing elſe* in the World, but a ſuperſtitious Intruſion, of the Hypocritical Scribes and Phariſees, and their Adherents.

III. There are ſtrong Reaſons to conclude, from divers Paſſages of the New Teſtament, that

that Baptiſm was not in Uſe among the *Jews*, as a religious Right, neither before nor in the time of our Lord Chriſt, till it was practiſed by *John* the Baptiſt.

As for Inſtance, the *Jews* being ſtartled at the Employment of *John* in baptizing vaſt Numbers of People, deputed ſome Meſſengers to him to demand, who he was, and what the Reaſon of his Practice was? *John* 1. 19, ------ *When the Jews ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem to ask him who art thou?* v. 21. *And they asked him, what then, art thou Elias?* ---- *art thou that Prophet?* v. 25. ---- *and they ſaid unto him, why baptizeſt thou then, if thou be not that Chriſt, nor Elias, neither that Prophet?*

It ſeems to me evident, beyond Contradiction, that baptizing was a *new Practice*, and that *John* had at this time begun it, and the *Jews* were very uneaſy to know the Meaning of it. Nay, they ſeem'd to inſiſt that no Perſon had Authority to attempt to ſet up ſuch a new Practice, unleſs he brought his Credentials along with him from God. He muſt prove himſelf to be either that *Chriſt*, or *Elias*, or that *great Prophet* that was expected. Accordingly *John* openly declar'd, that he was immediately ſent or commiſſion'd from God to *baptize*, *John* 1. 33. and 'tis very obſervable, that *John* acquir'd a famous Name by this Buſineſs, ſuitable to his Profeſſion, which was *Plunging* or *Dipping* in Water, therefore he is called *John* the BAPTIST, or DIPPER, from that Day to this. Again, take another Inſtance, *Mark* 11. 30. Where our Saviour puts

the Queſtion to the *Jews*, about the Baptiſm of *John*, *was it from Heaven, or of Men? Anſwer me*; had it been a known Cuſtom among the *Jews* before *John*'s time, 'twould have been an eaſy Matter for them to anſwer our Saviour roundly, *that it was from Men*, for they had practiſed it long before *John* appeared, or pretended to it. But the *Jews* were confounded, becauſe they knew nothing of the Buſineſs of Baptiſm, 'till *John* was ſent with a new divine Commiſſion, to begin the Adminiſtration of it. Therefore the ſubtile *Jews* anſwer'd our Lord with a great deal of Cunning, that they could not tell whence it was, and indeed this was their beſt way to come off. I ſhall add but one Inſtance more to this Purpoſe, and that is *Luke* 7, 29, 30. ---- *And the Publicans juſtified God, being baptized with the Baptiſm of John. But the Phariſees and Lawyers rejected the Counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him.* Here Baptiſm is expreſsly called the Counſel of God, which, if it was invented before of Men, it could not be called ſo, in any tolerable proper Senſe; if the Scribes and Prieſts in their way of Caballing had found it out before, then it could not be truly ſaid to be the *Counſel of God*, as it is ſaid here to be, in an abſolute Manner, and in the ſtrongeſt Terms; for then, it would have been only God's borrowing it from the *Jews*, and approving what they had already prepared to his Hand. Nor can any thing be more diſparaging to his Honour, or more derogating from his Wiſdom, than to impute ſuch a thing

to our bleſſed Lord. What! that he ſhould be beholden to the whimſical Brains of the Jewiſh Scribes and Lawyers, for one of the moſt ſolemn Ordinances of the new Teſtament! a Thought to be abhorred by all, who have any due Reverence for divine Inſtitutions!

But that I may more clearly ſhew, how inſufficient and precarious, this way of ſupporting Infant-baptiſm, is, I ſhall obſerve to the impartial Reader, theſe following Things.

I. That the earlieſt Jewiſh Writers take no Notice of baptizing Infants, as a religious Rite. 'Tis not pretended that *Joſephus*, or *Philo-judæus*, who both wrote in the firſt Century of Chriſtianity, mention this Buſineſs. And *Joſephus* is well known, to write on purpoſe to give an Account of the Cuſtoms and Ceremonies of the *Jews*. His Silence therefore in this Affair, ſeems a ſtrong Argument that he knew nothing of the Matter. I may add further, that it is not to be found in the Apocryphal Writings of the *Jews*, which were penn'd between the Days of the Prophet *Malachi* and the time of *John the Baptiſt*, after the *Prophetic* Spirit ceaſed, in the *Jewiſh* Church.

II. The Books out of which, ſome have attempted to prove Infant-baptiſm before our Saviour's time, are of too late a Date, to anſwer the End for which they are brought. I choſe to confirm what I now advance with the Authority of the great *Buxtorf*, who is well known to be eminently ſkilful in all Jewiſh Learning. And he fixes the Date of the Jewiſh Books,

which the Rabbies eſteem to a ridiculous Degree, and which contain the main Treaſure of their Traditions to theſe following Periods, *viz.*

The *Miſhna* was finiſh'd	*Anno Chriſti*	219
The *Jeruſalem Talmud* - - - -		230
The *Babylonic Talmud* - - - - -		500

The Paſſage is in his *Synagoga Judaica*, and for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I ſhall tranſcribe his own Words, which are theſe:

* *This Book (the* Miſhna*) was finiſhed, eſtabliſh'd and received by the whole Synagogue of the* Jews *(that all of them might live according to it at that time, and their Poſterity for ever afterwards, as they do at this Day) in the Year of Chriſt* 219. And after having mentioned one *Jochanan* to be Author of the † *Jeruſalem Talmud*, he ſays, *'twas compoſed in, or about the Year of our Lord,* 230. *and had the Name given it of the* Jeruſalem Talmud; *which Book becauſe it is obſcure, hard and difficult to be underſtood, is the leſs in uſe, and even to this Day, is not much damaged by the Hands of the Readers.*

---

* Hic Liber fuit abſolutus, confirmatus, & ab univerſa Judæorum Synagogâ receptus, ut juxta illum omnes ea tempeſtate Judæi, poſteríque illorum, deinceps ſemper viverent, uti etiamnum hodie vivunt, Anno Chriſti 219. *Buxt. Syn. Judaica, Cap.* 3. *p.* 52 *Edit. Baſil.* 1661.

† Poſt aliquot annos exortus eſt quidam Rabbi Jochanan, Anno 230. ejusque Liber Talmudis Hieroſolymitani nomen obtinuit: qui quoniam obſcurus eſt, durus, & difficilis intellectu, minor ejus ſemper fuit uſus ——— nec ad hæc uſque tempora, legentium manibus valdè teritur. *Buxt. ibid. p.* 60.

As

As to the * *Babylonic Talmud*, he ſays, *That it was compleated in the Year of Chriſt* 500. *Thus the entire* Talmud *being finiſhed and ſign'd, it acquired the Name of the* Babylonic Talmud.

Now, what I deſire the Reader to obſerve, as very material in this Controverſy, is, that it is not pretended that this Jewiſh Baptiſm is to be found in the *Miſhna*, nor yet in the *Jeruſalem* Talmud; ſo that the whole Authority of this Tradition muſt reſt upon the *Babylonic* Talmud, which is bringing of the Thing down ſo low, as 500 Years after the Days of *John the Baptiſt* and our *Saviour*. And pray, who is obliged to believe theſe fabulous Writers, when they mention a Practice, which they ſay was in Vogue 500 Years before their Time, without giving us any other Satisfaction, than their own bare Word. Indeed had theſe Men referr'd us to genuine and credible Authors, of competent Date to prove this Buſineſs, it would have been ſomewhat more to the Purpoſe; but to expect that we ſhould be amuſed to rely upon their Teſtimony, is mere Vanity, and would be ſuch a Piece of unreaſonable and blind Submiſſion in us, as we ſhall never pay, and the World might juſtly laugh at us, if we did.

Again, as to any Thing of this Nature, that is urged from *Maimonides*, it ſtill bears the leſs Credit, in Proportion to the Diſtance of Time

---

* Ita ut Anno Chriſti 500. integrum Talmud abſolutum, obſignatum, Talmudiſque Babylonici nomen conſequutum fuerit. *Buxt. ibid. p.* 61.

that he lived in, after Chriſt. He flouriſhed in the twelfth Century, about 1160, and what Sanction could he give to a Tradition about a Ceremony, ſaid to be practiſed by his Forefathers, above eleven Hundred Years before he was born. The Thing is ridiculous in its own Nature. Nor can I ſee, but that Dr. *Hammond*, who lived in the laſt Age, is of as good Authority every whit, as to the Caſe in Hand, as the famous *Maimonides* himſelf, who lived about 600 Years ago.

Beſides I may add, 'tis notorious, that the *Rabbies* diſagree among themſelves, about this Affair of Jewiſh Baptiſm, the one denies it, the other affirms it; thus we are every way left in the Dark, by Perſons of indifferent Credit, and very ſlender Reputation at beſt.

III. It may be worth our while, to conſider the Manner of compiling theſe Works already mentioned: and it was thus; the *Jews* after the Deſtruction of their City, Temple and Land, found themſelves in a very contemptible and diſperſed Condition, and began at length to bethink in earneſt, how they might beſt revive, and preſerve and propagate among them, their beloved oral Traditions, *i. e.* the unwritten Dreams, and ſuperſtitious Fancies of their Forefathers, with which they abounded. But in proceſs of Time, by the Conduct of ſubtile Doctors, and wiſe Rabbies, by retentive Memories, and fruitful Imaginations, they found Materials enough to compoſe their Book, called *Miſhna*. They are ſaid to ſet about this Work,

in

in the ſecond Century, and to finiſh it, either about the latter End of that, or the Beginning of the third. For as the Reader will find, there is ſome ſmall Difference in computing the exact Time of finiſhing this Book, called *Miſhna*. However, all this was done after many Diſputations and Conſultations, what to put in, and what to leave out. But for Satisfaction in this Point, it may not be improper for me here, to give a conciſe Account of this Matter, from the ingenious Dr. *Bray*, which he had collected from ſeveral ſkilful Hands. His Words are theſe, * *The* Jews *diſtinguiſh their Law, into* oral *and* written, *they ſay the* oral *is the Explication of the* written *one.* And a little lower, he ſays, *it might not be foreign to the Purpoſe to connect and ſubjoin a ſhort Hiſtory of ſo famous a Subject from* Maimonides, R. D. Ganz. Hottinger, F. Sim. *and others.*

He carries on his Account in the following manner, † " *In the ſecond Century as the worthy* " Hottinger *ſays, in his Hiſtory,* chap. 2. *the whole Study*

---

* Diſtinguunt Judæi legem in oralem & ſcriptam, oralem ſcriptæ explicationem eſſe ajunt &c. ---- ſed non abs re forſan fuerit, hiſtoriolam rei tam inſignis, ex Maimonide, R. D. Ganz, Hottingero, P. Sim. aliiſque contexere & hic ſubjungere. Dr. Bray's Bibl. Paroch. p. 99.

† Secundo maxime ſeculo, ut addit Cl. Hottingerus in ſuâ Hiſtoriâ C. 2. Omnis Judæorum opera occupata fuit, in vindicandis & conſcribendis *δευτερώσεσι*, ſeu traditionibus *ἀγράφοις*, quæ hinc inde ſine ordine, hucuſque erant diſperſæ; ---- At R. Juda cognomento *Sanctus*, qui apud Talmudiſtas

" *Study of the Jews was to recover, and put toge-*
" *ther in Writing their ſecondary Law, or their*
" *unwritten Traditions, which till this time were*
" *ſcatter'd, here and there, without any Order at*
" *all.* --- *But* R. Judah *Sir-named the Holy, who*
" *is among the Talmudiſts ſtiled,* Rabbi, *by way of*
" *Eminence, in the Year of Chriſt* 190, *by the*
" *Favour of the Emperor* Antoninus, *and fearing*
" *leſt the* Jews *wandring through different Nati-*
" *ons, ſhould be deprived of ſuch excellent Trea-*
" *ſure, did reduce all the Laws and Ordinances of*
" *their Anceſtors, into general Rules. This Book*
" *which to this Day makes up the Text of the Jew-*
" *iſh Law, is called* Miſhna, *&c.* And a little lower he adds, " *This Book being publickly read in the*
" *Schools of* Judea, *and being explain'd and enlarg'd*
" *by the various Diſputations of Doctors, out of all*
" *which put together, was the* Jeruſalem Talmud
" *produced, in the Year of Chriſt* 230.

As to the Talmud of *Babylon*, upon which the main Streſs of this Jewiſh Baptiſm is laid, it bears a very diſagreable and indeed odious Cha-

---

Talmudiſtas, Rabbi, ſine adjectione per excellentiam dicitur, Anno Chriſti 190, indulgentia Antonini Imperatoris, veritus ne Judæi inter Gentes vagabundi, tam præclaro privarentur Theſauro, Anteceſſorum ſuorum Placita & Conſtitutiones, in Aphoriſmos redegit; ---- vocatur hic Liber, qui etiamnum hodie textum Juris Judaici conſtituit, *Miſhna.* &c. ---- hic deinceps ſequentibus annis, in Scholis Judææ, publicè prælectus, & variis Doctorum Diſputationibus illuſtratus & auctus eſt; ex quibus omnibus in unum congeſtis Anno Chriſti 230, prodiit Talmud Hieroſolymitanum &c.

D. Bray's Bibl. Paroch. p. 101. Edit. 1707.

racter

racter among learned Men; *viz.* * that it is *a Hotch-potch of Calumnies and Blaſphemies againſt our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and his Church.*

Again we are aſſured, that † *this Book, the Talmud of Babylon, is full of unaccountable Lyes, and written contrary to the Divine Law, and the Holy Scripture, and even the Law of Nature, yet 'tis decreed, that it ſhall be capital Puniſhment, for any one to deny any Thing ſaid in it.*

But, I muſt deſire the Reader to conſider well, how the Authors of theſe Books came at the Things contain'd in them; and how ſo rich a Cargoe wherewith they are laden, was tranſmitted down to the Compilers. We muſt know then, that the great Man, mentioned already, " || Rabbi Judah the holy, *related the Things,* " *which he had received from his Father Simeon,* " *as he did from his Father Gamaliel, and he* " *from his Father Simeon again, he from his Father* " *Hillel, he from Shemaiah and Abtalion his Tu-* " *tors; they from the Son of Judah Tabæus, and* " *from*

* Nihil aliud eſt, quam farrago injuriarum & blaſphemiarum contra Jeſum noſtrum, & Eccleſiam ejus. Dr. Bray ibid. p. 102.

† Hic liber Talmud ----- plenus eſt inextricabilibus mendaciis & contra omnem divinam Legem, ſacram Scripturæ ſcilicet, & naturæ Legem, conſcriptus; ſub pœnâ tamen capitis edictum eſt, ne quis neget quicquam eorum, quæ in eo dicantur. Dr. Bray, ibid. p. 249.

||Judah, utpote qui referret quæ acceperat a Simeone patre ſuo, ut ille a Gamaliele patre ſuo, ille a Simione patre ſuo, ille ab Hillele patre ſuo, ille a Shemaiah & Abtalione præceptoribus ſuis, illi à Juda Tabæi filio, & Simeone Shatahi filio

" *from Simeon the Son of Shatahus; they from*
" *Joſhua the Son of Pherahæus, and Natheus the*
" *Arbelite; they from Joſe the Son of Joezer, and*
" *Joſe the Son of Juchanan; they from Antigonus-*
" *Socenſis; he from Simeon the Juſt; he from Ez-*
" *ra who ſurviv'd the great Synagogue, Ezra*
" *from Baruch the Son of Neria his Tutor; Ba-*
" *ruch the Son of Neria from Jeremiah, and Je-*
" *remiah, without Doubt, from the Prophets, who*
" *received Things from one another, to the very*
" *Elders, who took from Joſhua what he had re-*
" *cieved from Moſes. Now Rabbi Juda, having*
" *collected their proverbical Sayings and Words,*
" *ſet his Hand immediatly to the Compoſing of*
" *the Miſhna &c.*

We may now imagine that we are come to the Spring-Head, or rather the diſmal and dark *Abyſs*, from whence Jewiſh Rabbinical Traditions are derived, and from whence ſome Modern Pædobaptiſts think fit to fetch Infant-Baptiſm. For ſince they can't find a ſatisfactory Foundation for it in the New Teſtament, nor in the earlieſt Eccleſiaſtical Accounts of the Chriſtian Church, they are of late become, as it

---

filio, illi a Joſua Pherahæi filio, & Natheo Arbelita, illi a Joſe Joezeri filio & Joſe Juchanani filio, illi ab Antigono Socenſi, ille a Simione juſto, ille ab Ezra (quoniam ipſe ex ſuperſtitibus Synagogæ magnæ fuit) Ezra verò a Baruce Neriæ filio, Præceptore ipſius, Baruc autem Neriæ F. a Jeremia, ut & Jeremias ſine dubio acceperat a Prophetis, qui alii ab aliis acceperant uſque ad Seniores, qui Joſuæ quæ ipſe a Moſe retulit acc epta tulerunt. Collectis igitur ſententiis, & dictis iſtis, manum admovit R. Juda componendæ Miſhnæ &c. Dr. Bray, ibid. p. 100.

were

were, beholden to the Ingenuity of the Jews, for Sanctuary, or a Place of Refuge. And ſurely, the feebleſt Eye may eaſily diſcern, that People are very hard put to it, when they are obliged to build one of the moſt ſacred Ordinances of the Goſpel, upon ſo ſandy and ruinous a Foundation as this. And yet as ſorry a ſhift as this is, * Dr. *Hammond* confeſſes in his Queries, 'tis the beſt he could find to ſupport the Practice: his Words are theſe, *By all this appears, how little needful it will be to defend the Baptiſm of Chriſtian Infants, from the Law of circumciſing the Infants, among the Jews, the Foundation being far more fitly laid in that other of Jewiſh Baptiſm*, &c. And a little further he adds, that divers common ways of proving Infant-baptiſm are imperfect, ſaying, *the whole Fabrick being ſufficiently ſupported, and built on this Baſis* (*the cuſtomary Baptiſm among the Jews*) &c. A mean and contemptible Foundation, to bear the Wight of a Goſpel-Inſtitution, and unworthy of ſo great a Man!

---

* Quæries, p. 191, 195.

Chap. II.

Acts 2. 38, 39. *conſider'd. Infant-Baptiſm cannot be proved from thence, according to the Confeſſion of* Dr. Hammond, *and* Dr. Whitby. *The Baptiſm of whole Houſholds examin'd; the Inſtances produc'd, inconſiſtent with Pædobaptiſm.*

I come now, to Mr. *W*'s next Command for baptizing Infants, p. 10. and 'tis Acts, 2. 38, 39. where he tells us, *that St. Peter in the Cloſe of his Sermon exhorts or commands thoſe, to whom he preached, to be every one of them baptized, and enforces it by this powerful Motive, that the Promiſe was to them and to their Children.* Here the Reader may obſerve, a repeated Inſtance of Mr. *W*'s unfair Dealing with the Scripture, for he ſays, *that the Apoſtle exhorts or commands thoſe, to whom he preached, to be every one of them baptized*; whereas the Apoſtle commanded or exhorted them, to *repent firſt*, and *then* to be *baptized*, as may be ſeen by reading the Text at large. *Then Peter ſaid unto them, repent and be baptized every one of You, in the Name of the Lord* Jeſus, *for the Remiſſion of Sins, and, ye ſhall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, for the Promiſe is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.*

'Tis

'Tis evident, that *Repentance* is enjoin'd here as well as *Baptiſm*, in order to receive the Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt. But Mr. *W.* ſilently paſſes over it, for it not only made againſt him, but would ſpoil his whole Deſign, of grounding Infant-Baptiſm upon this Text.

He tells us the Argument ſtands thus, *all are (He* means *were) to be baptized who had Intereſt in the Promiſe; but Parents and Children were intereſted in the Promiſe*; I hope Mr. *W.* will ſtay, till the Parents and Children have come up to the Terms, here required, before they have an Intereſt in the Promiſe; 'tis required of them to *repent* and to be *baptiz'd* in expreſs Words; now, that Infants are incapable of Repentance is evident, and therefore have nothing to do with Baptiſm in this Place. Beſides there is no Colour of Reaſon, to reſtrain the Term *Children* here, to a State of *Infancy*, but to underſtand it of Poſterity; * Dr. *Hammond* and Dr. *Whitby* foreſaw this, and therefore gave up all Hopes, of proving Infant-Baptiſm from this Text. For the Scripture-Argument is very natural, and will ſtand thus,

All who repent and are baptized, have an Intereſt in the Promiſe,

Divers Parents and Children repent, and are baptized, therefore, *&c.*

So that the fair Argument makes directly

---

* Vide Dr. *Hammond*'s Queries, and Dr. *Whitby* in loc.

for

for the *Baptiſts*, and concludes as ſtrongly againſt the *Pædobaptiſts*, as may be eaſily ſeen by forming the Argument again, and it will ſtand thus.

All who repent and are baptized, are intereſted in the Promiſe,

But Infants are incapable of Repentance and being baptized, therefore, *&c.*

Nor can it be prov'd upon Scripture-Evidence, that God has any where promis'd, the Effuſion of the Spirit upon mere Infants, in the Senſe of the Apoſtle in this Place. And the immediate following Context ſhews, 'twas with the Adult only, the Apoſtle had to do at this Time, *v.* 40, 41, 42, 43. *and with many other Words did he teſtify and exhort, ſaying, ſave your Selves from this untoward Generation. Then they that gladly received his Word were baptized, and the ſame Day there were added unto them, about three thouſand Souls.*

And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and Fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers.

And Fear came upon every Soul, and many Wonders and Signs by the Apoſtles, and all that believ'd were together.

So that upon a full View of the whole Matter, here is not one Word, nor the leaſt Intimation of Infants. That it is the Effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt is intended in this Place, is very plain from the foregoing Context, *v.* 16. -------- 21. the Paſſage is taken out of the Prophet *Joel*, and cited at large by the Apoſtle *Peter*,

Peter. This is that which was ſpoken by the Prophet Joel, *And it ſhall come to paſs in the laſt Days ſays God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Fleſh, and your Sons and your Daughters ſhall propheſie, and your young Men ſhall ſee Viſions, and your old Men ſhall dream Dreams.* The Apoſtle applies this v. 39. *The Promiſe is unto you and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Here ſeems to be a ſatisfactory Explication of what is meant by their Children, *viz. their Sons and their Daughters, who ſhould propheſie; and their young Men who ſhould ſee Viſions.* All which is far enough from intending poor *Babes*, or ſuch who are in a mere State of *Infancy.*

As to the Interpretation, which Mr. *W.* gives to that Part of the Words, *as many as the Lord our God ſhall call, p.* 17. where he ſays, *That the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of a Perſonal, but a General Call*, this will do him and his Cauſe no manner of Service; for Infants are as incapable of the one, as of the other. Nor can any Man of Senſe and ſerious Thought be prevail'd with, to imagine that Infants, are capable of a general Call, by the Preaching of the Word, or the Miniſtry of the Goſpel; he muſt be credulous to a Prodigy, that can ſwallow and digeſt this.

II. I proceed to conſider Mr. *W*'s ſecond Head in Proof of Infant-Baptiſm, from Precedents or Examples. *P.* 10. he begins thus, *I apprehend we have many Precedents or Examples of Infants having been baptized.* To which I

anſwer, if he can but produce one, I ſhall be ſatisfied; and promiſe to diſpute the Point with him no further. But he goes on, telling us, *it was the Apoſtles Practice to baptize whole Houſes or Houſeholds.* I can aſſure him, that my Brethren, the Baptiſt-Miniſters, and my ſelf particularly, would be very glad of Opportunities, to do as the Apoſtles did, *i. e.* to baptize the ſeveral Members or Branches of Families, where the Grace of God ſeem'd evidently to appear in each. Mr. *W.* comes to Particulars, *When we read of ſo many Believers and their Houſes being baptized, as* Lydia *and her Houſhold,* Acts 16. 14, 15. Criſpus *and all his Houſe,* Acts 18. 8. Stephanus *and his Houſhold,* 1 Cor. 1. 16. *the Keeper of the Priſon, and all his,* Acts 16. 33. *I think we can't but conclude that there were Children in ſome of theſe Houſes, ſince ſo few Families are without Children, and that they were baptized.*

I obſerve, that Mr. *W.* ſets out here in the dark, upon a bare precarious Suppoſition, and beggs hard that his Point might be granted him. He does not ſingle out any Inſtance to argue from, but that of the Jailor, as moſt likely to do him any Service. But for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I will examine each of them, and ſhew that the Scripture ſays ſomething, concerning moſt of theſe Families, that is utterly inconſiſtent with Infant-Baptiſm. I begin with that of *Lydia*, *Acts* 16. 14, 15. concerning whom, I would take Notice of the following Things. 1. This Woman ſeems to have

have been a ſingle Woman, whether Maiden, or Widow, is not material; ſince there is no Mention made at all of her Huſband, and ſhe is repreſented, as the ſole Head of her Family. 2. If ſhe was a Widow, who can tell, whether ſhe ever had any Children? or whether any of thoſe Children liv'd, if any ſuch were live-born? 3. She was at a conſiderable Diſtance, from her own proper ſettled Habitation; for ſhe was a Woman of *Thyatira*, tho' now at *Philippi*, upon the Account of her Trade, ſhe being a Seller of Purple; and 'tis not very probable, that a Woman ſhould encumber herſelf with Infants, when ſhe was going to diſtant Towns or Cities, on the Affairs of Merchandize. 4. As to the Quality of thoſe who made up her Houſhold, the moſt rational Conjecture ſeems to be, that they were Servants, who were aſſiſting to her in her Buſineſs, ſince the Scripture is totally ſilent, about her Huſband or any Children. Certainly very few People, tho' ever ſo zealous, would preſume to baptize their Infants, upon ſo dark and dubious an Authority as this.

The next Inſtance Mr. *W.* gives us, is that of *Criſpus* and all his Houſe, *Acts* 18. 8. but, he might have ſpared mentioning this Family, for it goes in expreſs Terms againſt him; for 'tis ſaid.they all believed, even the whole Houſe: *And Criſpus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue believed on the Lord with all his Houſe.*

The next Example Mr. *W.* produces, is the Houſhold of *Stephanus*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. but if he

reads the latter End of this *Epiſtle*, he will find himſelf greatly diſappointed in this Inſtance alſo; for if there were Infants in this Family, they are ſaid to be ſuch, as had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints. 1 *Cor.* 16. 15. *Ye know the Houſhold of Stephanus, that is the firſt Fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints.*

The laſt Inſtance, that Mr. *W.* produces under this Head of baptizing of Houſholds, to juſtify Infant-Baptiſm, and upon which he ſeems to faſten and to enlarge, as if he had found ſome Proof of it, in the Caſe of the Jailor, *Acts* 16. 33. But, the bare Reading of this Text alſo, will ſoon ſhew, that 'tis againſt him in very ſtrong Terms. v. 32, 33, 34. *And they ſpake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his Houſe. And he took them the ſame Hour of the Night and waſhed their Streipes, and was baptized he and all his ſtrait way. And when he had brought them into his Houſe, he ſet Meat before them, and rejoyc'd believing in God with all his Houſe.* Here are ſeveral Things expreſsly aſſerted, that are incompatible with the Capacities of Infants; as, 1. that *Paul* and *Silas* ſhould *ſpeak the Word of the Lord, to all that were in the* Jailor's *Houſe.*

2. They rejoyc'd in the religious Converſation of *Paul* and *Silas,* and in the Manifeſtation of the Grace of God to themſelves and others.

3. They believed in God, in Conjunction with

with the Maſter of the Family: If theſe are Mr. *W*'s Infants, I am of Opinion, that he will ſcarce be able to match them, or to find ſuch a Set of infantile Domeſticks, in any Jailor's Houſhold, throughout His Majeſty's wide and extenſive Dominions.

I would now willingly have diſmiſſed this Head, there being nothing more offer'd, that is material in it, but that Mr. *W*. has advanc'd an odd Notion, at the Cloſe of it, *p.* 12. wherein I think, very few of his Pædobaptiſt Brethren will concur with him, which is this, *viz.* He tells us, *that if Miniſters were to convert a Family of Jews or Turks, they might upon the Converſion of the Heads of the Family, baptize the whole Houſe. If there were none it that refuſed Baptiſm.*

I would likewiſe readily excuſe, his obſcure way of delivering his Sentiments here; for he talks firſt of converting a *Family of Jews and Turks*, and afterwards only of converting the *Heads of a Family*, as if there were no Difference between a *Family* and the *Heads of a Family*: Here again I am at a Loſs, what he means by the *Heads* of a Family, whether the *Husband* and *Wife*, or whether he adds to them ſome *prime Servants*, as Steward, Houſekeeper, *&c.* For if I may be allowed, to gueſs at his Meaning, by the Words immediately following, he ſeems to diſtinguiſh between *Children* in general, and this *Headſhip* in particular, whatever it conſiſts of. But upon the Whole, he roundly declares his Opinion, *that at the*

Converſion of the Heads of the Family, Miniſters might baptize the whole Houſe, if there were none in it that refuſed Baptiſm. So that the only *Bar*, or *Reſtriction*, that he puts to prevent the baptizing of the moſt ignorant, and profligate Wretches in a Family, *is their refuſing to ſubmit to Baptiſm.* For if they are but willing to have the Act performed, he, on his part, is always ready to adminiſter it to them, without any more a doe. He will, it ſeems, proſtitute one of the moſt *ſacred* and *ſolemn Ordinances* of the New Teſtament, to thoſe who have liv'd in a conſtant Courſe of the groſſeſt Debaucheries, that can be thought of, without any previous Examination and Inſtruction, or any viſible Tokens of true Repentance. If a *Negroe-Slave*, juſt bought, and newly imported from *Africa*, who is as ſtupid as a Beaſt of the Field, and is altogether ignorant of the *true God*, and of the *Chriſtian Religion*, I ſay, if ſuch a miſerable Creature ſhould be caſt into Family, *where the Heads are converted*, Mr. *W.* will give his Warrant to baptize him immediately.

Humiliation and Repentance towards God, and perſonal Faith in *Jeſus Chriſt*, are needleſs Qualifications for Baptiſm in Mr. *W*'s Eſteem.

He does not think, that any preparatory Knowledge of the Goſpel, is neceſſary to baptize a *Jew*, *Turk*, *Indian* or *Ethiopian*, if the Party lives under the Roof of a Chriſtian Convert, for that alone will protect him, and ſufficiently entitle him to holy Baptiſm, provided, that the poor Creature does not reſiſt, or refuſe

the Ceremony. And was it ſo from the Beginning! No certainly. Mr. *W.* has forgot the *Word of Exhortation*, or Command, which ſhould have been nigh unto him, and even in his Mouth, and in his Heart, and *which ſaith on this Wiſe.----Go ye teach all Nations baptizing them*, &c. Matt. 28. *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature, he that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, but he that believeth not ſhall be damned.* Mark 16. 16, 17.

But when he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadduces come to his Baptiſm, he ſaid unto them O Generation of Vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath that is to come, bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance, and think not to ſay within your ſelves we have Abraham to our Father. Matt. 3. 7, 8.

And the Eunuch ſaid, ſee here is Water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, if thou believeſt with all thine Heart, thou mayeſt. Acts 8. 36, 37.

There are divers Pædobaptiſts, whoſe Zeal carries them ſo far, as to think they may ſafely baptize Infants, on the Account of their Parents Faith, without ſeeking any other Foundation, to go upon. But I acknowledge, that I never convers'd with any ſedate Perſon, who choſe this extraordinary Way with our Author, *raſhly to baptize* ignorant and prophane Servants, merely, upon the Converſion of their Maſters to Chriſtianity. And I think that *African* Servants, who are pretty numerous in this Nation,

living under *Chriſtian Maſters*, may be thankful to Mr. *W.* in that he has not declar'd it lawful, to tie them Neck and Heels, and to baptize them whether they would or not, purely becauſe their Maſters are Chriſtians. And I ſhall learn by Degrees, not to be ſurprized at any Thing that he may advance as to Baptiſm, ſince I begin now to be ſomewhat acquainted with his Latitude, and the Licenciouſneſs of his Conſcience, in Lumping of Families at this Rate, and baptizing of them in the Groſs, without ſhewing the leaſt Regard to perſonal Qualifications, which are ſo plainly, and ſo poſitively inſiſted on, every where in the New Teſtament.

CHAP. III.

The Argument from the Covenant examin'd. A plain and conciſe Definition of the Covenant of Grace. The Sentiments of the firſt Reformers, of the Church of England, *and of the Aſſembly at* Weſtminſter *about it. Divers Queries relating to it, reſolved. Circumciſion no Seal of this Covenant, to the* Jews. *Baptiſm no Seal of it, to Chriſtians. Several Objections of Pædobaptiſts, fully anſwer'd.*

I Now proceed to the third Ground of Proof, that Mr. *W.* offers for Infant-Baptiſm, *viz.* Scripture-Conſequences, and he begins his Introduction to it, in the following manner. *As to Scripture-Conſequences I think we have many, which prove Infants Right to Baptiſm, and ſuch as would be ſufficient to juſtify the Practice had we no other Proof.*

I ſhall paſs by his Introduction, ſince there is Nothing in it like an Argument, unleſs this ſhould be thought one, *viz. p.* 13. where he declares *his Surprize, that thoſe who allow Scripture-Conſequences, in the Caſe of the Womens Right to the Sacrament (of the Lord's Supper) and the Change of the Sabbath, will not allow them, when brought to prove Infants Right to Baptiſm.*

Here

Here he looks upon Womans Right to the Lord's Supper, and upon the Ground of our Obſervance of the firſt Day of the Week, and Infants Right to Baptiſm, to be upon an equal Foot; and he ſeems mightily pleaſed, that he has found an unſurmountable Difficulty, in his Opinion, which the Baptiſts will not be able to get over. Therefore he repeats it again and again, in his Treatiſe. However, I ſhall reſerve a proper Place, to give the Reader a ſatisfactory Solution of this ſeeming Difficulty. But at preſent I ſhall advert to his Arguments, drawn from Scripture-Conſequences, to prove Infant-Baptiſm.

1. The firſt he produces is in theſe Words, *viz. The Information we have from Scripture that Infants always were in the Covenant of Grace. From whence I think clearly follows their Right to Baptiſm, the initiating* SEAL *of the Covenant of Grace, under the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, unleſs it can be proved that they were at any Time caſt out of Covenant, the Proof of which lies on the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm.*

This is the main *Pillar*, of the Structure of Infant-Baptiſm, and indeed the *Baſis* upon which, moſt of the *Diſſenting Pædobaptiſts* lay their chief Streſs, and often ſerves them for the laſt Reſort, when they are fairly diſlodged from all other Holds. Therefore it deſerves an impartial Diſcuſſion. I obſerve then, that the former Part of this Paragraph, is laid down in the Form of a Propoſition, *viz.* thus, *that Infants always were in the Covenant of Grace.*

As

As this Propoſition is delivered in an unguarded, looſe and indefinite Manner, I openly and abſolutely deny the Truth of it. And therefore ſhall take the Liberty, to enquire into theſe following Things, as preparatory to clear up this Point, ſo much inſiſted on by him and others, in Defence of their Practice of baptizing Infants.

1. What the Covenant of Grace is?
2. Whether all Children indefinitely conſidered were always in it?
3. Whether all the Children of Believers themſelves were always infallibly in it?
4. Whether the Children of Unbelievers were not ſometimes in it?
5. Whether the Covenant made with *Abraham* was, ſimply and ſtrictly ſpeaking, the Covenant of Grace?
6. Whether Circumciſion under the Old Teſtament, and Baptiſm under the New Teſtament, are any where in Scripture, ſaid to be the Seals of the Covenant of Grace, to thoſe to whom theſe Ordinances were applied?

I. I begin with the firſt of theſe, What is the Covenant of Grace? I anſwer, in the moſt impartial and faithful Manner, that I am capable of;

'Tis that ſolemn Covenant, wherein the Almighty God, has graciouſly aſſured all ſpiritual Bleſſings both of Grace and Glory, to his own peculiar

peculiar People; and has inviolably engag'd that they ſhall be eventually and eternally his, thro' Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator.

The Appellation, that Divines have thought proper to give it, *viz.* the Covenant of *Grace*, very well ſhews the Complexion, the Contexture and Nature of it, for the Parties reſpectively concern'd in it, deal all in *Grace*. The *Great God* as the *Donor*, his *favourite People* as the *Receivers*, and *Jeſus Chriſt his Son*, as the *Mediator*, to ratify and eſtabliſh this kind Tranſaction with his *own Blood*. The moſt clear and unconteſted Place of any that I know, in the whole Bible, where this Covenant is reveal'd and mentioned with Certainty, and with the LEAST Shadow or Incumbrance, is in *Heb.* 8. 10. *For this is the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of Iſrael, after thoſe Days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a People.* I know not, whether this *Definition* may pleaſe or not; however I am ſatisfied, that the Account I have given as to the Subſtance of it, is much to the ſame Purpoſe, with this Scripture-Declaration of the true Covenant of Grace. For as this myſterious Contract, is of God's own Making, ſo there are no others comprehended in it, but thoſe of his own Putting: Neither Infants nor Adult, can be intereſted in it, but ſuch only concerning whom, God himſelf has freely promis'd, that he would be their God, and they ſhould be his Sons and his Daughters.

I am

I am well aware, that the moſt eminent Pædobaptiſt-Writers, ſince the *Reformation*, have taken Care to inſert the natural Seed of Believing Parents, as included in this Covenant. And tho' I pay a very conſiderable Veneration, to their great Judgments, in many Points, yet I dare neither follow nor truſt them in this Matter; being well aſſured from the holy Scriptures, that the *Infants* who are comprized in this Covenant, are enrolled in God's eternal and ſecret Purpoſes, and concerning whom he has unchangeably determin'd and ſaid, as of *Jacob when in the Womb, before he had yet done any Good or Evil, that he loved the Perſon.* I may add with equal Truth, that whoſoever is not in this Covenant (by vertue of the previous Counſel of God) in his Infancy, will never be found in it, in his Years of Maturity. And on the other hand, whoſoever is in it, in his Infancy, in the Senſe aforeſaid, ſhall never be permitted, to throw himſelf finally out of it. For there is an *eternal* Line of Care and Love, reaching from the very *firſt Formation* in the Womb, thro' all the Stages of Life, to a ſafe Arrival in Glory, *i. e.* the Party ſhall be aſſuredly called in the Series of Time, by the Efficacy of divine Grace, and ſhall be kept by the *mighty Power of God, thro' Faith unto Salvation*; nor is there, properly ſpeaking, any ſuch thing, as a Poſſibility of fruſtrating, or diſappointing the direct Deſigns of God in this Covenant. 'Tis a Chain that can neither be alter'd nor broken. Hence it is unconteſtably plain, that no Man

can

can put himſelf into this Covenant, much leſs can he put his Child, or the neareſt Relative that he has, into it. Therefore for Parents to pretend, to entail upon their Children, an Hereditary Right to the Covenant of Grace, is, preſumptiouſly to claim a Charter, that was never granted them; or in plainer Terms, to invade God's Sovereignty, and to take his proper Work out of his Hands.

And from hence we may further ſee, how vain and groundleſs Mr. *W's* Doctrine is, as ſcatter'd up and down in his Book, when he talks of *entring Children into this Covenant of Grace.*

Whereas 'tis undeniably evident, from the Scripture-Account of the Nature of Things, that 'tis God's Province and Prerogative only, to enter or inſert Names into this heavenly Contract; and upon this everlaſting Covenant, as upon an *immoveable Foundation*, by a wiſe Maſter-Builder, is the eternal Salvation of the whole *Church* of God laid. *The Foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, having this Seal, the Lord Knoweth them that are his.* 2. Tim. 2. 19. *For whom he did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be conform'd to the Image of his Son, moreover whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called, and whom he called them he alſo juſtified, and whom he juſtified them he alſo glorified. What ſhall we ſay to theſe Things? If God be for us, who can be againſt us?* Rom. 8. 29, 30, 31. Now if Things ſtand thus, as they moſt certainly do in the Apoſtle's Eſtimate, I may venture to ask the Reader, what he thinks of Mr. *W's* Propoſition? which is laid down in a looſe

looſe and general Way, *viz.* that Infants always were in the Covenant of Grace. As if Infants in Common, had an undiſtinguiſh'd Intereſt in this myſterious Covenant. Whereas the Scripture teſtifies the direct Contrary, as may be ſeen by the declared Caſe of *Jacob* and *Eſau* before they were born; and which I ſhall have Occaſion farther to improve, hereafter. But before I diſmiſs this Head, it may be proper to remind the Reader, that I have already hinted the divine Regularity, Uniformity, and Faithfulneſs of the Covenant of Grace.

All who are intereſted in it (by the preordinative or decretive Will of God) in their Infancy, ſhall infallibly and effectually be called by the Holy Spirit, ſooner or later in their Life-time. They ſhall be made actually to lay hold on this Covenant, and be made willing *to yield themſelves to the Lord*; for this is the expreſs Engagement on God's Part, *I will put my Laws into their Minds, and write them in their Hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a People.* 'Tis an eſſential Part of this Covenant, for God to make them *a willing People in the Day of his Power.* And herein appears the Freedom and Fullneſs of his Grace, in that, nothing ſhall obſtruct the Execution of his kind Deſigns of Love towards them. *If they break my Statutes and keep not my Commandments, then will I viſit their Tranſgreſſion with the Rod, and their Iniquity with Stripes. Nevertheleſs my loving Kindneſs will I not utterly take from him, nor ſuffer my Faithfulneſs to fail. My Covenant will*

I not break, nor alter the Thing that is gone out of my Lips. Pſalm 89. 31, --- 34. Hence it is called *an everlaſting Covenant, order'd in all Things and ſure. 2 Sam.* 23. 5.

A Covenant of Peace that ſhall never be removed, Iſaiah 54. 10. *A Covenant eſtabliſhed upon better Promiſes Heb.* 8. 6. which Places I look upon, to contain the everlaſting and unchangeable Nature, of the bleſſed Covenant of Grace. This was the Doctrine, upon which the *glorious Reformation* was built, not only *abroad*, but here at *home*, as may be evidently ſeen, by the fundamental Articles of the *Church* of *England*, particularly the *ſeventeenth* which runs thus; in Words at length.

" *Predeſtination to Life is the eternal Purpoſe* " *of God, whereby (before the Foundations of the* " *World were laid) he hath conſtantly decreed by* " *his Counſel ſecret to us, to deliver from Curſe and* " *Damnation, thoſe whom he hath choſen in Chriſt* " *out of Mankind, and to bring them by Chriſt to* " *everlaſting Salvation, as Veſſels made to Honour.* " *Wherefore they which be endued with ſo excellent* " *a Benefit of God, be called according to God's* " *Purpoſe by his Spirit working in due Seaſon:* " *They through Grace obey the Calling: They be* " *juſtified freely: They be made Sons of God by A-* " *doption: They be made like the Image of his only* " *begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt: They walk religiouſly* " *in good Works, and at length by God's Mercy* " *they attain to everlaſting Felicity.*

That this Doctrine was ſtrenuouſly maintain'd, in the moſt abſolute Senſe, for a conſiderable time

in

in the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, is undeniable, at leaſt till towards the Middle of the *laſt Century*. We have an eminent Inſtance, in a *pious Biſhop* defending this Doctrine, and ſeverely inveighing againſt an *Arminian* Writer, who had dedicated a Book to King *Charles the Firſt*, entituled an * *Appeal to Cæſar*. But the Rev. *Biſhop*, who was Dr. *George Carleton*, then of *Chicheſter*, complains of him in this Manner, *viz.* "*The Author of the* "*Appeal has troubled the Church of* England, "*with ſtrange Doctrines in two Things eſpecially*; "*firſt in the Doctrine of Predeſtination, he attempt-*"*eth to bring in a Decree reſpective, which he tak-*"*eth for granted to be the Doctrine of our Church:* "*But this will never be granted by us, nor proved* "*by him. Secondly he taketh it likewiſe for granted* "*that the Doctrine of our Church is, that a Man* "*may fall away from Grace totally and finally*; "*if his Meaning be that ſuch as are called and juſti-*"*fied according to God's Purpoſe may ſo fall away,* "*this was never a Doctrine of the Church of* England. And a little further, *The Church of* England *was reform'd by the Help of our learned* "*and reverend Biſhops, in the Days of King* Edward *the ſixth, and in the Beginning of the Reign* "*of Queen* Elizabeth. *They who then gave that* "*Form of Reformation to our Church, held Conſent* "*in Doctrine with* Peter Martyr *and* Martin Bucer, "*being by Authority appointed Readers in the two* "*Univerſities*; *and with others then living, whom* "*they judg'd to be of beſt Learning and Soundneſs,* "*in the reformed Churches.*

* Anſ. to the Appeal p. 1 ---- 4.

But I would obſerve further, that the *Aſſembly*'s *Catechiſm* clearly maintains this *Doctrine* of the *Covenant*. 'Tis ask'd Queſt. 20. *Did God leave all Mankind to periſh in the State of Sin and Miſery?* The Anſwer is made, *God having out of his mere good Pleaſure, from all Eternity, elected ſome to everlaſting Life, did enter into a Covenant of Grace to deliver them, out of the State of Sin and Miſery, and to bring them into a State of Salvation by a Redeemer.* Having premiſed theſe Things, and having thus fairly ſtated from Scripture and good Authority, the true Nature of the Covenant of Grace, my Way is in a great Meaſure prepar'd to ſolve the next Querie, *viz.*

II. Whether *all Children indefinitely, or univerſally conſidered, were always in the Covenant of Grace*, according to Mr. *W*'s Propoſition? I may ſafely anſwer, that they were not; nor do I think, that he himſelf upon a Recollection of Things, notwithſtanding all his Latitude and extenſive Allowance for Infants, will attempt to maintain this Poſition, that Infants, *quatenus Infants, were always in the Covenant of Grace.*

Were the Children and Poſterity of *Cain*, that notorious Proto-Murderer, baniſh'd into a wild and wandering State of Life, and whoſe *Deſcendants* are diſtinguiſh'd from the *Sons of God*, in expreſs Words, were theſe I ſay in the Covenant of Grace?

Or, were the *Infants of the Daughters of Men*, which they had, by Cohabitation with the *Sons of God*, and it ſeems proved to be, that formidable but impious Race of *Giants* upon Earth, which

we read of *Gen.* 6. I ask whether *theſe* were in the Covenant of Grace?

Again, were the Infants of thoſe profligate Generations, who utterly periſhed with their Parents in the Deluge, and who were ſwallowed up by the general Vengeance of God, upon a brutal World, were theſe likely to be in the Covenant of Grace? I am ſure their Extraction from ſuch Parents, and all other Symptoms attending them, do not beſpeak any ſuch Thing of them.

Nor do I ſuppoſe that Mr. *W.* can imagine that all the *Infants* of *Mahometans*, *Chineſe*, *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Indians*, together with thoſe of *Negroes and Moors of Africa*, at this Day, are in the Covenant of Grace; if they are not, he muſt either revoke his Propoſition, or cultivate and correct it, 'till it bears ſome Reſemblance of Truth, at leaſt. Therefore

III. I proceed to another Enquiry, *viz.* Whether *all the Children* of *Believers themſelves*, *were always in the Covenant of Grace?* I anſwer, that the Scripture gives Room and Reaſon enough to conclude, that they were not. There are very few Divines, but what will allow, that the Covenant of Grace, was revealed to, and eſtabliſhed with, our firſt Parents *Adam* and *Eve*, immediately after the Fall, and that they themſelves were included in it. *Gen.* 3. 15. where God promiſes, that the *Seed of the Woman ſhall bruiſe the Head of the Serpent.*

I would willingly begin, with the earlieſt Believers in the *Meſſiah*, in Order to take a View of their *Children.* And here I would ask, Are there

any Foot-ſteps in divine Revelation, that lead us to conclude, that *Cain* the very *firſt Infant* that was born of a Woman, was in the Covenant of Grace as well as his Brother *Abel*? I confeſs, I think that the Hints we have of him in the New Teſtament, rather determine the Contrary, *i e.* that he was not. 1 John 3. 12. *not as* Cain *who was of that wicked one, and ſlew his Brother*, &c. Jude 11. *woe unto them for they have gone in the Way of* Cain, &c.

The Caſe ſeems to be much the ſame, in Regard to *Ham* or *Cham*, the Son of *Noah*? the *Father* was not only a *righteous Man*, but a *Preacher of Righteouſneſs*; tho' the *Son* was pronounced by the Inſpiration of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to *be contemptible among Men upon Earth*, and was rejected as to himſelf and Poſterity with *Marks* of divine Diſpleaſure, and from his *Race* came the *Canaanites*, whom God determin'd to Deſtruction, that their *Land* might be given to *Iſraelites*: But, I choſe to inſtance, in ſome of the moſt eminent Believers in after-Ages, ſome of whoſe Children appear not to be in the Covenant of Grace. If we conſider *Abraham* himſelf, there is no Body will affirm that *Iſmael* was in it. Again was *Eſau* in this Covenant? concerning whom the Lord himſelf had ſaid, *before he was born, or having done either Good or Evil*, Jacob *have I loved and* Eſau *have I hated.* But if we take a View of the great Patriarch *David*, not only a Believer, but a remarkable Type of the *Meſſiah*; we have very deplorable Inſtances, and Evidences of his Children, who do not ſeem to be intereſted in the

Covenan

Covenant of Grace, with their godly Father. His Son *Amnon* committed Inceſt with his own Siſter and was ſlain by *Abſalom*, in Revenge of the Injury and Diſgrace done her, nor do we find, that he had any Remorſe, or Senſe of that Evil before he died.

Not long after this, *Abſalom* rebells againſt his *Father*, commits Inceſt openly in the Face of the Sun with his Father's *Wives*, and dies by violent Hands, without any Intimation of Repentance, in the very Act of *unnatural* Rebellion. In ſome Time after this, *Adonijah*, another *Son* of *David* proclaims himſelf King in his Father's Life-time, contrary to the Expreſs Deſign of God, and againſt the Conſent of his own *Father*, and was afterwards ſuddenly put to Death by *Solomon*, probably for his private Intrigues in aiming at the Kingdom. I can't think that any conſiderate Man, nor that Mr. *W.* himſelf will take upon him to prove theſe Sons of *David* to be in the Covenant of Grace, with the *good old Patriarch*. It would be an eaſy Matter, to produce more melancholly Inſtances of this Kind; but, are there not deplorable Examples of religious Parents, in our Days, who have wicked Children, even ſuch who in all outward Appearance, live and die in a State of Unregeneracy. This is ſufficient to overthrow Mr. *W*'s Propoſition, and to demonſtrate that 'tis not to be depended upon, without careful Alteration, and Correction.

IV. I come to the fourth Enquiry, *viz.* Whether *ſome Children of Unbelievers*, were not *ſometimes* in the Covenant of Grace? I anſwer

that they frequently were, and often are, ſtill in our Times. This is ſo unqueſtionably true, that the Proſelytes under the Old Teſtament, who immediately deſcended from idolatrous Parents, and received the ſaving Knowledge of the true God, by embracing the Jewiſh Religion, and truſting in the *Meſſiah* who was to come, theſe I ſay, were undoubtedly in the Covenant of Grace. *Rahab* tho' an *Harlot* and a *Canaaniteſs*, yet was in the Covenant of *Grace*, and being married to *Salmon*, became of the *Stem* of the *Meſſiah*, and has the Honour to be recorded, *as ſuch*, *Mat.* 1. 5. And *Ruth* was a *Moabitiſh Woman* and appears to be the great Grand-mother of *David*, and accordingly they were both inſerted in the Genealogical Line of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as the firſt Fruits of the *Gentiles*, who ſhould in time, be more fully called and received by him. Therefore, the New Teſtament will furniſh us, with notable Inſtances to this Purpoſe.

As the *Canaaniti∫h* Woman, who apply'd to our Lord in the Behalf of her Daughter, *Mat.* 15. 22. Our Saviour treated her at firſt, as if ſhe had been a-kin to Dogs, or at leaſt, as if ſhe had ſprung from Anceſtors as vile as Dogs, and yet at laſt, he graciouſly yielding to her Requeſt, granted her the Deſire of her Heart, at the ſame Time highly approving and applauding her Faith. *O Woman great is thy Faith!*

Again, the Caſe of the *Roman Centurion* deſerves a particular Mention, *Mat.* 8. 5. he beſought our Lord, on Account of his Servant that he might be healed, and he mix'd his Arguments,

ments, with ſuch a noble Exerciſe of Faith, as our Lord had not found among all the Families of *Iſrael* v. 10. *Verily I have not found ſo great Faith, no not in* Iſrael. *And I ſay unto you that many ſhall come from the Eaſt and Weſt, and ſit down with* Abraham, *and* Iſaac *and* Jacob *in the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt out*, &c.

Now, the Uſe that I would make of theſe, and the like Examples, is, to ſhew the Inſufficiency and Precarioufneſs of this Way of arguing, and that no Man can determine, what Children, nor whoſe Children, are in the Covenant of Grace, whether the Children of Believers or Unbelievers? the Children of Godly or of ungodly Parents? God has made no Diſtinction between them in the Goſpel, nay he aſſures us the contrary, that *all are Children of Wrath*, and that unleſs *they are born again, they ſhall never ſee the Kingdom of God.*

'Tis in vain, for Mr. *W.* and others to plead, that they have *Profeſſors*, or *Believers*, as ſo many *Abrahams* to their *Fathers*, for, *God is able out of the very Stones, to raiſe up Children to* Abraham. The Sovereign and free Grace of God, is not to be bounded in the *Channel* of natural Generation. *That which is born of the Fleſh is Fleſh*, John 3. 6. And were it not for the ſtrange Prejudice of Education, few Men would be ſo raſh and thoughtleſs, as to conclude, that natural Birth, does *by Blood*, give a Right to the Covenant of Grace; this is a Doctrine, that the Goſpel is an utter Stranger to, and tends to deſtroy the Method of

free Grace in our Salvation, inſtead of promoting it. At this Rate of arguing, the Church of God, now under the Goſpel, would be confin'd within the Compaſs of few profeſſing Families, and entailed upon them. Than which nothing is more ridiculous, as well as repugnant to the whole Tenor of the New Teſtament. There needs no more be ſaid at preſent, to ſhew, that this Method of Reaſoning, that Mr. *W.* and many other Pædobaptiſts take, is very fallible and inconcluſive.

V. The fifth Enquiry is this, *Whether the Covenant made with* Abraham, *Gen.* 17, *was, ſimply and ſtrictly ſpeaking*, the Covenant of Grace? I anſwer in the Negative, that it was not; but then I affirm, and hope to prove theſe following Things.

1. That this was a mix'd or compoſite Covenant, conſiſting partly of temporal, and partly of ſpiritual Conditions and Bleſſings. The beſt and ſafeſt Way to underſtand the Nature of this Covenant, is, for the Reader to conſult the Text, where the Terms of it are ſet down at Length, *Gen.* 17. v. 2 ---- 14. Now, "if a numerous "*Poſterity*, and being the *Father of many Nati-* "*ons*, and having *Kings* to come out of his *Loins*, "and having the *Land of Canaan* given to him "and his *Seed after him* as a free and ſettled *In-* "*heritance*, and the taking of his *Servants* and "*Bondmen*, and *all born in his Houſe or bought* "*with his Money*, to come under the outward "*Token* of this *Covenant*, and to crown all, to "have the *Promiſe of God to be his God and the* "*God of his Seed.*" I ſay if theſe ſeveral Things, are

are not of *diſtinct Natures*, if they are not diſtinct *Ingredients*, to make up this *compound Covenant*, I confeſs I have loſt all *Ideas* of *Mixtures and Compoſitions*. And he that can deny that *temporal* and *eternal* Things, are *diſtinguiſhable* in their own Natures, muſt firſt renounce common Senſe, and then I think, he is at Liberty to deny any thing.

2. This Covenant made with *Abraham*, was a peculiar Covenant, in its Structure, and Circumſtances, or 'twas peculiarly deſign'd, as a domeſtick Covenant with *Abraham*. This can't reaſonably be deny'd, if it be conſidered, that 'tis ſuch a Covenant, as God was not pleaſed to make with any before him, nor with any in his Time, nor yet with any after him. Did God ever tranſact after this Manner, and in theſe Particulars, with any before *Abraham*'s Time? 'tis plain that he did not. Again did God engage after this Manner, with any in his Time, or that were contemporary with him, as with *Melchizedeck*, *Lot*, and other godly Perſonages, that might be mentioned? Why was *Abraham* to be thus honoured? There can be no other Anſwer, than that 'twas a peculiar Prerogative, that God in his Sovereign Pleaſure, was willing to confer upon him. Further did God ever make ſuch a Covenant, with any Perſon after *Abraham*'s Time, in any Age or Nation of the World? Perhaps ſome may be ſo weak as to urge, that God made the ſame Covenant with *Iſaac* and *Jacob* and their *Lineage*; but ſurely this is meer trifling, for the *original* Covenant made with *Abraham* was the *Occaſion* of *Iſaac*'s *being at all*, and therefore he is called the

Son

Son of the Promiſe, and *Abraham's Covenant* ran thus, *in Iſaac ſhall thy Seed be called.* So that tho' the Stream of this *notable* Covenant, ran thro' the Lineage of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, yet the proper *Fountain-Head* was in *Abraham.* And I conclude, that theſe Conſiderations do ſufficiently evince, this, to be a Covenant of *Peculiarity*, in Regard to *Abraham.*

3. I am willing and ready to grant Mr. *W.* and the Pædobaptiſts, all that poſſibly I can, conſiſtent with the Scriptures of Truth, and a good Conſcience; and therefore I freely allow, that the vital Parts of the Covenant of Grace, are contained and intended, in this Tranſaction with *Abraham.* And ſince I have attempted to ſhew that 'twas a *mixt* Covenant, conſiſting partly of *earthly*, and partly of *heavenly* Things, I freely confeſs, the better and *ſpiritual Part* of it, to be the proper *eternal* Covenant of Grace. But then this fair Conceſſion, will be of no manner of Uſe to Mr. *W.* nor to the Buſineſs of Infant-Baptiſm, which he pleads for. Therefore we have ſomewhat, of great Moment in this Controverſy ſtill before us, and that is to determine, who are intended and included in the ſpiritual and eternal Part of this Covenant eſtabliſhed with *Abraham*: Or in other Words, with what *Seed* of *Abraham* God did engage, in a proper, ſpiritual, and *everlaſting* Senſe of *Salvation.* If this Matter can be cleared up, it will vaſtly aſſiſt People to diſcern, what ſort of Intereſt all Believers under the Goſpel of the *Gentile Extraction*, have in the Covenant of *Abraham*, conſider'd as the Covenant of Grace.

And

And to anſwer this End, I ſhall take the Scripture for my Rule, and ſhall briefly point out to the Reader, what *Seed* God had in his Eye, when he made the Covenant with *Abraham*, and promiſs'd *to be his God, and the God of his Seed.*

1. The prime Seed then, that God intended in covenanting with *Abraham*, was *Jeſus Chriſt the Mediator*; who for this Reaſon is ſaid, *not to take upon him the Nature of Angels, but the Seed of* Abraham, Heb. 2. 16. Now if the *New* Teſtament be the beſt Interpreter of the *Old*, and that we imagine the *Apoſtle Paul* to underſtand well, God's Covenant with *Abraham and his Seed*, he refers the Paſſage directly to *Jeſus Chriſt.* Gal. 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his Seed were the Promiſes made, he ſaith, not, and to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy Seed which is Chriſt.* And this is the Seed, *in which all the Nations upon Earth were to be bleſſed.* v. 8, of the ſame Chapter, *and the Scripture foreſeeing, that God would juſtify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Goſpel unto* Abraham, *ſaying, in thee ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed.* 'Tis from hence evident beyond Contradiction, that Chriſt was the principal Seed intended here, as the *Head* and *Repreſentative* of his *Church and People.*

2. The Sovereign God, in making that Part of the Covenant, which was properly ſpiritual, with *Abraham* and his Seed, reſpected only *true Believers*, and no others, of all Ages and Nations of the World, afterwards. For this Reaſon, *Believers* in Chriſt, and *Abraham*'s *ſpiritual Children*,

dren, are always in the Goſpel reckoned one and the ſame Seed, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Chriſt's, then are ye* Abraham's *Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe.* This Doctrine is ſo confirmed and explained, in this Chapter, that he that runs may read it. v. 7. *know ye therefore, that they which are of Faith, the ſame are the Children of* Abraham. v. 9. *ſo then they which be of Faith, are bleſſed with faithful* Abraham. The ſame Doctrine is alſo maintain'd *Rom.* 4. 11. where ſpeaking of *Abraham, that he might be the Father of all them that believe, tho' they be not circumciz'd*, and v. 13, ſpeaking ſtill of *Abraham, for the Promiſe that he ſhould be the Heir of the World, was not to* Abraham, *or to his Seed thro' the Law, but thro' the Righteouſneſs of Faith.* and v. 16. *therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace; to the End that the Promiſe might be ſure to all the Seed, not to that only which is of the Law, but to that alſo which is of the Faith of* Abraham, *who is the Father of us all, as it is written I have made thee a Father of many Nations.* Now, can any Words put an Argument in a ſtronger and clearer Light, than that, in which the Apoſtle has put this Caſe in hand? *viz.* that the true ſpiritual Seed of *Abraham*, is in the Covenant of Grace, and no others are intereſted therein, according to the Goſpel.

Having thus impartially repreſented that Part, which was, truely and properly, the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, wherein 'tis plain, that only his ſpiritual Seed, was comprehended; I would ask Mr. *W.* and ſome other Pædobaptiſts, with what Shadow of Truth, would they

pretend

pretend to thruſt their natural Seed, into this Covenant of Grace? Are they ſure they be the choſen of God? Are they born again, are they of the *Faith of Abraham*? If they are not, they have neither Lot nor Portion in this Covenant, by any natural Deſcent. Multitudes of *Abraham*'s own natural Seed, were not in the Covenant of Grace, as may be demonſtrated from Scripture; how then comes the natural Seed of *ordinary Gentile Believers* to be in this Covenant? If the great *Patriarch* himſelf had not this Prerogative, to have all his natural Seed ſecured in the Covenant of Grace, have *Gentile* Believers obtained a better Grant for their *Offspring* in this Reſpect, than *Abraham* had for his?

Was not *Iſmael*, *Abraham*'s *Son* according to the *Fleſh*, and were not thoſe numerous People the *Iſmaelites*, the direct Poſterity of *Abraham*, and were they in the Covenant of Grace? the Goſpel declares the contrary, even that *Iſmael*, and his *Egyptian Mother and Poſterity were caſt out.*

Gal. 4. 30. *what ſaith the Scripture? Caſt out the Bond-Woman and her Son, for the Son of the Bond-Woman ſhall not be Heir with the Son of the Free-Woman.* Again was not *Eſau Abraham*'s direct lineal *Grandſon*, and that, by his beloved *Son and Heir Iſaac*, the very *Son* of the *Promiſe*, and yet was *Eſau* and the numerous *Edomites* and the wild Inhabitants of *Mount Seir* who came from him, were theſe in the Covenant of Grace? No Man ſurely will offer to aver, or prove ſuch a thing. Further, had not *Abraham* divers Children, by his

his ſecond lawful Wife *Ketura*, *Gen.* 25. as *Zimran*, *Jokſham*, and *Medan* and *Midian*, and *Iſhbak* and *Shuah?* Theſe multiplied to that Degree, that they became the *Fathers* and *Original* of the *Arabians* and *Midianites*, and now all theſe *Tribes* muſt be owned to be truely, properly, and lineally the *Seed of Abraham* according to the Fleſh, but the Queſtion I put to Mr. *W.* and the Pædobaptiſts, is, whether they were in the Covenant of Grace, with faithful *Abraham?*

But, to come nearer ſtill to the Buſineſs in Hand, if poſſible, let the Caſe of *Jacob*'s Poſterity be examin'd, and you will find that all the natural Seed of *Iſrael*, were very far from being in the Covenant of Grace.

The Scripture plainly determines the Contrary, and aſſures us, *Rom.* 9. 27. *that tho' the Number of the Children of* Iſrael *be as the Sand of the Sea, a Remnant ſhall be ſaved.* And v. 6, 7, 8. of the ſame Chapter, *for they are not all* Iſrael *which are of* Iſrael. *Neither becauſe they are the Seed of* Abraham, *are they all Children. That is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promiſe are counted for the Seed.*

Can any Scripture-Evidence be more poſitive and convincing, as to this Matter, that the natural Seed of *Abraham* and *Iſrael*, as ſuch, were not in the Covenant of Grace? And will Mr. *W.* and ſome Pædobaptiſts pretend, they have ſome ſuperiour Privilege, by urging that their Seed muſt be in it. This is, not only ſitting in the *Chair* of *Abraham*, the great *Heir* of the *World*, and the

Father

Father of the Faithful, but alſo, advancing their natural *Offſpring* infinitely above his, and all this is done, in direct Oppoſition to all Scripture-Evidence. By this Time the Reader may eaſily diſcern with what little Colour of Truth Mr. *W.* could aſſure the World, *that Infants always were in the Covenant of Grace.*

VI. The laſt Enquiry propoſed under this Head is, Whether *Circumciſion* under the *Old* Teſtament, and *Baptiſm* under the *New*, are in Scripture ſaid to be the *Seals* of the Covenant of Grace, *to all thoſe to whom they were applied?* Now in Anſwer to this Query, it may ſafely be anſwered, that Circumciſion was not a *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace, in the ſtrict Propriety of the *Phraſe*, or the *Idea* contained in it. For, Circumciſion was only a *Sign*, *Token*, or *Mark* of that *mix'd*, *domeſtick* or *peculiar* Covenant, that God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. and which we have ſpoken of already. But in Order to ſtate this Point in that fair Light that it requires, 'tis neceſſary to diſtinguiſh between, *Seal*, and *Sign*. Becauſe they are really diſtinguiſhable in themſelves. For, every *Seal* is a *Sign*, but every *Sign* is not a *Seal*. And 'tis evident, a *Seal* carries more Certainty, Strength, and *Authority* along with it, than a bare *Sign*, does. Therefore it has commonly been made Uſe of to ratify *Deeds* and *Grants*, or to give Sanction to the *Decrees* of *Princes*. As for Inſtances, the Reader may peruſe the following Paſſages, and ſee what Acceptation the *original* Word has in the *Scripture*. I have ſet down the *Hebrew* Term,

Hebrew

and how it is uſually rendered, in *Greek*, *Latin* and *Engliſh*; חָתַם HHatham, [*to ſeal*] *Eſth.* 3. 12. Chap. 8. 10. [ſealed] with the King's Ring. Fromthence comes חֹתָם HHotham, δακτύλιος, σφραγὶς, ἀποσφράγισμα, ſigillum, annulus, Seal, Signet. *Gen.* 38. 18, 25. *thy* [*Signet.*] Exod. 28. 11, 21, 36. *like the engraving of a* [*Signet.*] Chap. 39. 6, 14, 30. 1 Kings 21. 8. *and ſealed them with his* [*Seal.*] Cant. 8. 6. *ſet me as a* [*Seal*] *upon thine Heart, as a* [*Seal*] *upon thine Arm.* Job 41. 15. *ſhut up together as with a cloſe* [*Seal.*] Jer. 22. 24. *tho'* Coniah *were the* [*Signet*] *upon my Right Hand.* Hagg. 2. 23. *I will make thee* Zerubbabel, *as a* [*Signet.*] So that this Word, as far as I can find, upon ſtrict Search, is never applied to Circumciſion, to call it the *Seal* of the Covenant; and 'tis ſomewhat ſtrange, that People in our Day, ſhould accuſtom themſelves, to call it ſo, in the familiar Manner they do. Indeed the *Greek* Word σφραγῖδα, in the New Teſtament *Rom.* 4. 11. is applied to *Abraham*, the *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith.*

But then, 'tis applied to him, in a peculiar *paternal* Capacity, and in a Senſe, that it cannot be applied to any other: for unto whom could it be ſaid, that Circumciſion was a *Seal*, to confirm him, to *be the Father of all them that believe, the Father of Circumciſion, and the Heir of the World*, as it is ſaid in the 11, 12, 13, Verſes, but unto *Abraham* only? 'Tis beyond Contradiction, that the *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith* mention'd here, was applicable to *Abraham* alone, as a *paternal federal Head*, in which Senſe, it could not

not be called a *Seal*, to any other Perſon whatſoever. Therefore, the Word made uſe of in Regard to Circumciſion, *Gen.* 17. 11, where 'tis called the *Token of the Covenant*, is another Word, אות (ôth) and is rendered by the Sept. σημειον, *ſignum*, and in our *Engliſh* Bible, by a *Sign*, *Mark*, *Token*, *Enſign*. And indeed Circumciſion was, properly ſpeaking, the very *Sign* or *Mark* of the domeſtick, peculiar Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, for it left the *Mark* in the Fleſh; but it is not called in Scripture-Language, nor can it be called conſiſtent with Truth, the *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace. So that modern Writers have groſly abuſed this Term; the original Intention of Circumciſion, was ſo far from being a *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace, that it is never ſo much as called ſo, throughout the Old Teſtament. And 'tis as certain, it was adminiſtred to many thouſands, who never were in the Covenant of Grace. And this may ſuffice to ſhew the Vanity of this cuſtomary Phraſe, that ſome Pædobaptiſts are ſo fond of.

As to *Baptiſm* under the New Teſtament, there is no *Paſſage*, where it is ſo called; but Mr. *W.* makes no Scruple to ſtile it, the *initiating Seal of the Covenant of Grace*, P. 13. 24. and elſewhere. And 'tis common for divers Pædobaptiſts to term it thus, as if they had Scripture-Warrant for what they ſaid. This gives Ground, or at leaſt Occaſion, for ſome weak People to imagine, that the Application of Water to Infants, in the Ceremony of their Baptiſm, leaves

behind it, ſome unaccountable indelible Character, eſpecially if the Ceremony be perform'd, by a Miniſter, under Epiſcopal Ordination. Of this Number the late Mr. *Dodwell* and Mr. *Ruſſen* ſeem'd to have been. However Mr. *W.* freely and frequently calls it, a *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace. Whereas the Goſpel is a Stranger, not only to the *Phraſe*, but to the *Idea* annexed to it. For Baptiſm will ſecure or ſeal none to eternal Life; ſuch only ſhall be ſaved who thro' Grace, are intereſted in the *Blood of the everlaſting Covenant*, *Heb.* 13. 20. Therefore let not Parents flatter themſelves, and their Children in this Point; nor ſuffer themſelves to be deceived, by the empty Appellations, and groundleſs Notions, that their Teachers may have inſtilled into them; for according to the Goſpel, the Holy Ghoſt is the only one, and his Grace the only Qualification, that can be ſaid to *ſeal* the Covenant of Grace, to thoſe who are ſaved. Eph. 1. 13. *In whom alſo, after that ye believed ye were ſealed with the holy Spirit of Promiſe.* Chap. 4. 30. *And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are ſealed to the Day of Redemption.* 2 Cor. 1. 22. *Who hath alſo ſealed us, and given us the Earneſt of the Spirit in our Hearts.* *Simon Magus* had a clearer Right to Baptiſm, in *Foro Eccleſiæ*, in the Account of the Church, than any Infants can pretend to. For he was admitted upon Profeſſion of Faith, and yet his Baptiſm was far from being a *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace to him, for the Man was ſtill in the *Gall of Bitterneſs, and Bond of Iniquity*, Acts 8 13 ---- 23.

And

And there are too many deplorable Inſtances, among all Denominations, of thoſe who have been baptized, whether in *Infancy* or when *adult*, who teſtify by their Works, that they are utter Strangers, to the Grace of the Covenant of *faithful Abraham*. I ſhall only add, that I am well aware that divers of the *Fathers* ſtiled Baptiſm, the *Seal*, but does the Scripture call it ſo? Some of the *Fathers* made it neceſſary to Salvation, but does it therefore follow, that it is ſo? the *Romiſh Church* is indeed of that Opinion, but very few *Proteſtants* who have better ſtudied the Scriptures, will offer to maintain ſuch a Doctrine.

But to cloſe this Head, a *Seal* was only one of the *familiar* but *arbitrary* Names, which the *Ancients* gave to *Baptiſm*. And whoſoever will conſult *Gregory Nazianzen*'s fortieth *Oration* will find a Catalogue of *ſuch* Names, together with the *Reaſons* they thought proper to aſſign for them, in *thoſe Days*. And the *particular* Reaſon he gives, why *Baptiſm* is called *Seal*, is, in his own Words, delivered thus. * A *Seal, as keeping and denoting Dominion.*

What *Significancy* there is in theſe Expreſſions, I muſt leave for the Reader to judge. But ſhall obſerve that modern Writers have not been a Whit the happier, in explaining and defending this Point. And here I have a fair Opportunity

---

* σφραγίδα ἢ ὡς συνέχουσιν καὶ τῆς δεσποτείας σημείωσιν G. Naz. Orat. 40.

of inſerting a Collection of the Sentiments of divers conſiderable Men about this *Term*, from that learned and excellent *Author* in this Diſpute, Mr. *John Tombes*, † his Words are theſe, "Mr. *Baxter*'s plain Scripture, *&c.* p. 223. will "have Baptiſm *ſeal only the conditional Promiſe.* "Mr. *Philips* Vind. p. 37 *expreſſeth the ſealing by* "*Offering.* Mr. *Davenport*'s Confeſſion of Faith, "p. 39 *maketh the Benefits of the Covenant not to* "*be offerred in the Sacraments, but to be exhibited* "*only to true Believers.* Mr. *Cotton*'s Ground of "Bapt. p. 70. *Covenant of Grace doth not give* "*them ſaving Grace at all, but only offereth it,* "*and ſeals what it offereth.* Dr. *Homes, that the* "*Adminiſtration of the Covenant of Grace, be-* "*longs to Believers Children, tho' not the Efficacy.* "Dr. *Twiſſe, that Infants are in the Covenant of* "*Grace in the Judgement of Charity, and that* "*Baptiſm ſeals Regeneration,* &c. *not conferred,* "*but to be conferred.* Dr. *Thomas Goodwin, that* "*they are to be judged in the Covenant of Grace by* "*Parcels, tho' not in the Lump,* &c.

Here we have, *quot Homines, tot Sententiæ. As many Men, as many Minds.* And I ſhould think, it might ſerve as a Caution to us, not to pin ourſelves down to the *Occult* Phraſes of the *Antients*, eſpecially when we can fix no certain Ideas to 'em. And I freely acknowledge, that I am at a Loſs to comprehend the true Reaſon, why the two *Rites* of New Teſtament, (Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper) are ſo commonly called

† *Tombes*'s 3d Part Review, p. 226.

by

by the *Pædobaptiſts*, the *Seals* of the Covenant of Grace. 'Tis ſtill more ſtrange that *Infant-Baptiſm* ſhould be ſtiled ſo, ſince it is not ſo much as once mentioned in *all the Goſpel!* And beſides, don't we daily obſerve, that it is, and has been applied to *Multitudes* of Infants, who as they grow up to be *Men* and *Women*, do ſufficiently convince the World, that they never *taſted* of the *Grace of God?* What then, is become of this *Seal*, ſo much talked of, in Regard to theſe People? 'Tis a Demonſtration to me, 'twas only a *Seal*, applied to a *Blank*. Indeed, the Solemnity of the Phraſe, *(Seal of the Covenant of Grace)* may ſtrike an *Awe*, on the Mind of the *tender Parent*, and ſerve as a *popular* Engine to perpetuate the Practice, but upon a *fair* Examination, the *Pretence itſelf*, is but *mere Vanity*.

As to what Mr. *W.* urges, in the Cloſe of this Paragraph about the Covenant of Grace, and *Infants being caſt out of it, the Proof of which, he ſays, lies upon the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm:* I anſwer, 'tis no hard Task, for the Baptiſts to clear their Hands of this Objection; for 1. I have fully proved already, that Infants as ſuch, or as the Infants of Believers, never were in the Covenant of Grace; and if they never were in it, ſurely 'tis very improper, and weak beyond what is common, to talk of their *being caſt out of it*. Let it be proved fairly, that they were firſt in it, 'twill be time enough to diſcourſe of their Excluſion or Ejection afterwards. 2. Infants under eight Days old, were not in *Abraham's Domeſtick Covenant*

of Circumciſion. They had no Right to that *Ordinance*, at ſeven Days old. That Circumciſion is called a *Covenant* in expreſs Terms is evident, *Acts* 7. 8. ſpeaking of *Abraham* and God's tranſacting with him, 'tis ſaid, *he gave him the Covenant of Circumciſion.* If Mr. *W.* would know when Infants were caſt out of this Covenant, the Anſwer is ready and eaſy, 'twas when Circumciſion ceaſed to be an Ordinance of God, and that was at the *Death* of *Chriſt*. If Mr. *W.* can prove that Infants were put into any other Covenant, ſince that Time, let him produce the Place in the New Teſtament, where 'tis expreſſly ordain'd, or revealed. Let us know the *Date*, the *Nature* and *Terms* of this *Infantile* Covenant, or elſe 'tis high Time for him, and other Pædobaptiſts, to have done, with this frivolous, and thread-bare *Plea*, *viz. that it lies on the Baptiſts to prove when the Children were caſt out of Covenant*; eſpecially, ſince it has been ſufficiently ſhewn, from the holy Scripture, that Infants, as ſuch, *i. e.* as Infants of Believers, never were in the Covenant of Grace.

But becauſe there are common Objections, that Mr. *W.* and ſome others ſeem to lay great Streſs upon, and which are uſually connected with the Buſineſs of the Covenant, and the Subject I am now treating on, I choſe to ſtate them and anſwer them in this Place.

1. He asks, p. 16. *Can we ſuppoſe, that God's Goodneſs to Believers and their Seed, is any Way diminiſhed by the Goſpel? Does this Diſpenſation abridge them of any Privileges, to which*

they

they were before entitled? And more of this p. 24. *Can we ſuppoſe that God, who has ſo greatly enlarged his Favours to Mankind, under the Goſpel, as to admit all Nations into Covenant with himſelf, upon their embracing the Goſpel, would limit the Application of the Seal of the Covenant to the Adult only?* This is artfully enough contrived: and I take it to be one of the moſt popular Suggeſtions, to quiet the Minds of many honeſt Pædobaptiſt-Parents, in Regard to Infant-Baptiſm. But when 'tis taken to Pieces, and impartially weig'd, 'twill appear upon fair Examination, that there is nothing in it. For

1. If Chriſt intended to advance the Honour of the New Teſtament Worſhip, in Puriry and Spirituality, by eſtabliſhing Ordinances, that only ſuit thoſe who have Reaſon and Underſtanding, to conſider and know what they do: Is this any Diminution of the Privileges of Goſpel-Worſhippers? 'Tis the Glory of the preſent Diſpenſation, to have done with the Infant-State of the Church: This is the very Argument of the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 24 ---- 27. *Wherefore the Law was our Schoolmaſter to bring us to Chriſt, that we might be juſtified by Faith; but after that Faith is come, we ware no longer under a Schoolmaſter.*

The ſame Reaſoning is continued, in the Beginning of the next Chapter. *The Heir as long as he is a Child, differeth nothing from a Servant tho' he be Lord of all, but is under Tutors and Governors, until the Time appointed of the Father. Even ſo we, when we were Children, were in Bondage under the Elements of this World.* So that

if the *Abrahamic* Covenant, and the *Moſaic* Inſtitution brought Children to *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſover*, as I readily agree, they were Partakers of both; it does by no Means follow from thence, that Chriſt will admit Children, now to Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper. Has he not the ſole Authority, to ſettle the Laws of his Houſe, as he thinks fit? And if he has not thought proper, to order Baptiſm for Children in their Infant-State, will Men offer boldly to ſupply the *imaginary* Defect in the Law-giver, on Purpoſe, to make the Chriſtian Diſpenſation look like the *Jewiſh*? Who required this Service at their Hands?

2. The Goſpel accounts it a Priviledge, to the Children of the *Jews*, and believing Gentiles and their Children, that there was an End put to the Practice of Circumciſion. 'Twas a Degree of Chriſtian Liberty to be deliver'd from it. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2. *Stand faſt therefore in the Liberty, wherewith Chriſt has made us free, and be not entangled again with the Yoke of Bondage.* ——— *If ye be circumcis'd, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing.* And the Apoſtles called Circumciſion, and the Train of Ceremonies that attended it, *a Yoke that neither they nor their Forefathers, were ever able to bear*: And were glad, that they could tell the Churches of the Goſpel, that they had now got rid of it, by the Liberty, wherein Chriſt had placed them. *Acts* 15. 1, 2, 5, 10. Now 'tis apparently unjuſt, and abſurd to argue, from the Abrogation of Circumciſion, to the Inſtitution of Infant-Baptiſm. If the one was

aboliſhed,

aboliſhed, does it follow that the other muſt be appointed? Where is the Reaſon of this Conſequence? Nay the profound Silence wherein Infant-Baptiſm, is paſt by, in the Goſpel, ſufficiently indicates, that it was never deſign'd to ſucceed Circumciſion.

3. As to the Qualifications, pre-requiſite to Baptiſm according to the Goſpel, tho' they exclude Infants, from any Share in that Ordinance, yet do they by no Means affect their Salvation.

Indeed, if Circumciſion had been an infallible Seal, to ſecure the Salvation of all the Infants, to whom it was applied, 'twould be no Wonder to hear Parents Crying out, for ſomething to ſucceed it, of equal Virtue and Authority. But we know, that Circumciſion was only a temporary Inſtitution, to anſwer ſome particular Ends, in the *Families* of *Abraham* and the *Iſraelites*. And when thoſe Ends were anſwer'd, that Ordinance ceaſed, without any Ways affecting the State, or Salvation of Infants in the leaſt. They are as ſafe without it as with it. The Caſe is the ſame as to Baptiſm at preſent, it can neither put them in, nor out of a State, of Salvation. And what makes it altogether inſignificant to them, is this, that there is no Direction from God in this Matter. Therefore there is no need of ſtraining and wreſting the Goſpel, to bring Infants to Baptiſm; nor of hurrying, as a great many weak and zealous People do, to have it adminiſter'd to them, leſt they ſhould die before-hand. If they had a clearer Apprehenſion of the Way of Salvation, in the Goſpel,

they

they might ſoon be deliver'd from this ſlaviſh Fear.

4. If inſtead of Infants from *Abraham*'s Lineage thro' *Iſaac*, God has taken in, all the Families of the *Earth* under Goſpel, upon Faith and Repentance. This certainly makes abundant Amends for the Loſs that is complain'd of, by Mr. *W.* and others. Undoubtedly, all the Nations of the Earth are more numerous, than *Abraham*'s Poſterity can be ſuppoſed to be. God has given his *Son for Salvation to the Ends of the Earth*, and ordered *the Goſpel to be preached to every Creature, and as many as believe and are baptized ſhall be ſaved.* He has alſo promiſed to *pour down of his Spirit upon all Fleſh, the Promiſe is unto all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* And is not all this to be looked upon, as a full Compenſation, for aboliſhing the carnal Ordinance of Circumciſion, which was limited to the *Jews*, and few Proſelytes, with Slaves and Bondmen in their Families? Surely any one may readily judge, which is the more eligible of the two Diſpenſations. And the unprejudic'd *Reader* may plainly diſcern, from theſe Conſiderations, what little Force there is in Mr. *W*'s *Objection*, when he asks, *can we ſuppoſe that God's Goodneſs to Believers and their Seed is any Way diminiſhed by the Goſpel?* Who ſays it is? the *Baptiſts* always affirm, the Grace of God is enlarged, ſince the *Middle Wall of Partition*, between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, is broken down; and the Children of the *Gentiles*, if theſe Children fear *God* and believe in *Chriſt*, and not otherwiſe,

otherwiſe, have the ſame ſure Title to his Favour, as the Children of the moſt eminent *Jews* under the *Old* Teſtament, *once* had. For, this is the declared Method of Salvation, *to as many as receive him, to them he gives Power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his Name. Which are born not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of God.* John 1. 12, 13. Our Lord in this and other Places, abſolutely cuts off, all Pretenſions by Blood, to the Priviledges of the Goſpel, and the Favour of God.

II. Another Objection is this, Mr. *W.* ſays, p. 32. *that the Baptiſts put the Children of Chriſtians upon a Level with the Children of* Jews, Turks *and* Infidels, i. e. *leave them to the uncovenanted Mercies of God.* I anſwer,

1. I deſire to know, what difference there is by Nature, between the Children of profeſſing Chriſtians, and the Children of others. Are they any Way better than their Neighbours? The Goſpel knows of no Convenant made with the Children of believing *Gentiles*, any otherwiſe, than with the Children of their Neighbours.

2. Therefore, 'tis to no Purpoſe for Mr. *W.* and others to pretend, to a groundleſs Priviledge that can't be maintain'd by any ſound Doctrine; and 'tis an eaſy Matter to talk of a *baptiſmal Covenant of Infants*: But the Scripture is wholly ſilent about this Buſineſs. Tho' our Author ſpeaks of it, in as familiar a Manner, as if he had read it in the Goſpel, p. 64. where he adviſes Parents, early to acquaint their Children, with the Nature

Nature of the Baptiſmal Covenant: and a little lower, he tells us, *that Mr.* Philip Henry *drew up a ſhort Form of the baptiſmal Covenant.* But, I deſire Mr. *W.* to inform the World, who made this infantile *baptiſmal* Covenant. For 'tis evident from the Goſpel, that God did not make it. And I am ſure, the Parent has no Authority to make it, nor to ſtand Proxy for his Child in any baptiſmal Engagement. Again, the Miniſter has no Power, to make ſuch a Covenant for his own Infants, much leſs for thoſe of others; and laſtly the Child himſelf, is utterly ignorant and incapable of making any ſuch Covenant, ſo that the Reſult of the Matter is this, here is an amuſive Scheme, of a *baptiſmal* Covenant, projected, that has no Manner of Footing in the *New Teſtament.*

3. When Mr. *W.* charges the *Baptiſts with leaving their Infants, to the uncovenanted Mercies of God*; I deſire to know, whether they are not left in gracious, wiſe, and all-ſufficient Hands? or does he think that ſprinkling a little Water upon them, will mend their State?

4. Mr. *W.* confeſſes himſelf, that 'tis at their Baptiſm, Children are enter'd into this Covenant, be it what it will; and that no leſs than three times in the Compaſs of few Lines p. 32. 33. where he is endeavouring to excuſe *their Ignorance of the Covenant, which they are enter'd into by Baptiſm.* If they are enter'd into it, at that Time, they muſt have been *out* of it, before their Baptiſm, for they can't be ſaid in any propriety of Speech, or conſiſtent with Senſe, to be

entred

entred *into* it, if they were *in it* before. And if Infants are not in this Covenant before their Baptiſm, muſt not Mr. *W.* own, that *his Infants*, (during that Space) *are left to the uncovenanted Mercies of God*, as well as thoſe of the Baptiſts?

And according to this Way of arguing, the Almighty God left all the *Jewiſh Infants*, that died under *Eight Days old*, before they were circumciſed, to his *uncovenanted Mercies*. It might be proper for Mr. *W.* to elucidate this Point a little, and to give a better Solution of this Difficulty, before he delivers his Opinion, ſo *peremptorily* concerning the *Baptiſts*, that they put their *Children* upon a Level, with *Jews*, *Turks* and *Infidels*; i. e. *leave them to the uncovenanted Mercies of God.*

Perhaps, after all that has been ſaid, Mr. *W.* will tell us he only intended, that Infants were always under the *outward Adminiſtration* of the Covenant of Grace, *i. e.* admitted to *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſover*. I have already granted, they were undoubtedly admitted to both. But then, has our *Lord* any where directed they ſhould be received to *Baptiſm*, and the *Supper*, in *breaking of Bread?* Why will Men make *Parallels* where Chriſt has made *none?* If the Adminiſtration of *Goſpel-Ordinances* muſt be made every Way adequate to that of the *Law*, *Chriſt* is no longer allowed his Authority, nor is he permitted to be *Maſter* in his own *Houſe*. If Men are ſo fond of flying back to the *Moſaic Model*, what ſignify the Regulations that *Chriſt* has made under the *New Teſtament?*

Beſides,

Beſides, being under the *outward* Adminiſtration of the Covenant, is, I hope, a quite diſtinct Thing, from being *in it*. Is there no Difference betwixt being in a *Court* or *Yard* belonging to a *Houſe*, and being in the *Inſide* of the Houſe itſelf. Was there no Difference betwixt being the *outſide* of the *Ark*, and being ſecured the *inſide* of it in the Days of *Noah?*

And upon the whole, where is this *outward Covenant*, or *outward Adminiſtration* of it, peculiarly aſſign'd for the Children of *Profeſſors* any more than for thoſe of the *Prophane?* The Goſpel knows nothing at all of ſuch a Thing. This is the *Point* in *Debate*. Let Mr. *W.* or ſome *Pædobaptiſts* give a ſolid Proof of it. Otherwiſe the *Baptiſts* think 'tis full Time for them to have done with *groundleſs Declamotions* about a mere *imaginary Intereſt*, their Children have in this Covenant.

Thus, I have choſen, to lay open Mr. *W*'s Argument from the Covenant, and to examine every Thing I thought *material* in it, and to anſwer the moſt *popular* Objections, that are fram'd from that *Topick*, that the Reader may ſee Things in their Order, and in one View in this Place.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Mr. W. *repeats his Argument from* Acts 2. 38, 39, *to no Purpose. The Baptism of the* Israelites, *in their Passage thro' the* Red Sea, *consider'd.* Christ's *receiving Children into his Arms, and blessing them,* Mark 10, *and* Matt. 19. *no Ground for baptizing Infants. The cutting off the* Jews, *and ingrafting the* Gentiles *on the the Stock of* Abraham, *explained, and vindicated from the false Glosses of divers Pædobaptists. A transient View of Women's Right to the Lord's-Supper, of the Observance of the first Day of the Week, and the pretended Claim of Infants to Baptism.*

II. I Now proceed, to Mr. *W*'s second Scripture-Consequence, to prove Infant-Baptism, p. 16. which is thus, *the Assurance we have that the Promise belongs to Children, this St.* Peter *declares,* Acts 2. 38, 39. I answer, this Text, it seems, is pressed to very hard Service, and is of double Usefulness in this Argument, *i. e.* it serves at one Time for a *plain Command* to baptize Infants, but another Time, only for a *Consequence, viz.* that *Infant-Baptism may be inferr'd from this Place.* Accordingly we have a Repetition of the same Arguments, drawn from this Text, as thus, *If any one asks, who they were that he commanded to be baptized, the answer is plain, every one who had Interest in the Promise, now these*

theſe were Parents and Children. I think I have fully and clearly ſpoken to this Text, and to the Conſequences from it, already, when 'twas urged a Command to baptize, and ſince there is nothing *new* of any Moment, added to it, I have no Buſineſs to ſtay much longer here. And ſhall only obſerve, that it will be found as great a Difficulty, to prove, that the Word τέκνοις in this Paſſage, ſignifies *Infants*, and not *Poſterity*, as it will be found to ſhew, that the *Armies of Iſrael* who fought under *Joſhua*, againſt the *Canaanites*, were *Infants*, becauſe they were ſo often called the *Children of Iſrael.* And I have ſhewn that Dr. *Hammond* ſeem'd to be much of the ſame Opinion. But Mr. *W.* is ſo ready to catch at every Twig, that wherever he finds the Word *Children*, he thinks their *Baptiſm* muſt be nigh at Hand, *how far ſoever* this may be, from the Deſign of the *holy Penman.*

III. I paſs on, to Mr. *W*'s third Scripture-Conſequence, which is this, *viz. The Account we have of the Infants of* Jews, *being baptized under the Law, and the Infants of* Chriſtians *being in all Reſpects, as capable of Baptiſm, under the Goſpel, I may refer to the Teſtimonies already produced in Proof of this.* I anſwer if Mr. *W.* has no better Proof, than what he has produced hitherto, 'twill never ſatisfy the *Baptiſts*, nor many wiſe and conſiderate Men, among the *Pædobaptiſts.* He has certainly here forgot himſelf, for he was to have brought us *Scripture-Conſequence*, but he puts us off, with the ridiculous *oral* Traditions of ſome *doting Rabbies*, and

does

does he think to paſs this Cheat upon us? But he comes in the next Paragraph to make us amends, for he acquaints the Reader, thus, *ſince the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm, ſhew little Regard to human Teſtimony, I ſhall refer them to that Scripture Account,* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. *where the Apoſtle tells us, that all the Fathers of the* Jewiſh *Nation, who were under the Cloud, and paſſed thro' the Sea, were baptized unto* Moſes *in the Cloud and in the Sea.* Mr. *W.* makes ſome curious Remarks and Deductions in reaſoning upon this Head. As, *that all who came out of* Egypt, *Men, Women and Children, were they that were under the Cloud, and paſſed thro' the Sea, and were baptized unto* Moſes *in the Cloud and in the Sea.* To which I anſwer, that tho' there is nothing at all concluſive in this Inſtance, far from it; nor is there any thing of Moment in this *alluſive* Way of arguing, yet I would remark his unfair Method, of deducing and reaſoning from this Scripture. He lays the whole *Streſs* upon the *Apoſtle*'s making the *Infants, to be the Fathers ſpoken of here*; whereas there is no Ground to believe, that St. *Paul* had any Infants in his Intention. For he applies his Idea, if we may judge from his Words, to *Fathers* and *Heads of Families* paſſing thro' the *Sea*: And there is no Notice taken of Infants in the leaſt. And the following Context makes it neceſſary, to underſtand the *Apoſtle* as ſpeaking of *Fathers, Heads of Families*, and *adult* Perſons. For there are Actions aſcribed to them, which are utterly inconſiſtent with *Infancy*, and denote them to be *adult* Perſons when

they came out of *Egypt*. As particularly their luſting, and murmuring in a ſinful Manner, againſt God and his Providence. Compare the Paſſage with *Exodus* 16. 1, 2, 3. —— *and all the Congregation of the Children of* Iſrael *came unto the Wilderneſs of Sin, which is between* Elim *and* Sinai, *on the fifteenth Day of the ſecond Month, after their departing out of the Land of* Egypt. *And the whole Congregation of the Children of* Iſrael *murmured, againſt* Moſes *and* Aaron *in the Wilderneſs.*

And the Children of Iſrael *ſaid unto them, would to God, that we had died by the Hand of the Lord in the Land of* Egypt, *when we ſat by the Fleſh-Pots, and when we did eat Bread to the full: And in the* 17 Chapter, v. 3. *the People murmured againſt* Moſes, *and ſaid, wherefore is this that thou haſt brought us up out of* Egypt, *to kill us and our Children*, &c. Mr. *W.* would have us believe, that theſe were the Infants, who but few Weeks before, were in their Parents Arms in the *Red Sea*: Whereas the Text ſays, they had long before ſet down by the Fleſh-Pots in *Egypt*, and even that they had *Children* of their *own*.

However our Author is very poſitive, *p.* 19. that he has found out *Infant-Baptiſm* in this Place: For he ſays, *we have here an undeniable Inſtance of Infants being baptiz'd*, and not only ſo, *but 'twas performed by ſprinkling, and could be done no other Way*. P. 20. *They were baptiz'd by ſprinkling, this was the only Baptiſm they could have,, they were not plung'd into the Cloud or the Sea, but ſprinkled by the Gentile dropping of the Cloud*

Cloud upon them, and ſprinkling of the Waves as they paſſed along.

Mr. *W.* talks of this memorable Tranſaction, with as much *Aſſurance*, and in as *familiar a Stile*, as if he had been an Eye-Witneſs to it. And yet that the Sea on *either Side*, ſprinkled any Water upon them, or that the Cloud dropped any *Wet* upon them, *theſe are Things* that he knows *nothing* of. Nay the *Hiſtory* ſeems to be againſt him in this Point: For, 1. the Scripture ſays as to their *Paſſage thro' the Sea, that they walked upon dry Land*, not the leaſt Mention being made of *Slime*, *Mudd*, or *Puddles*. Exod. 14. 29. *but the Children of* Iſrael *walked upon dry Land in the Midſt of the Sea.* 2. As to the Sides of the *divided Waters*, on the Right and Left Hand, 'tis ſaid in the ſame Verſe already cited, *and the Waters were a Wall unto them on their Right Hand and on their Left.* And no Manner of Mention made of *Waves* in *pouring*, *daſhing* or *ſprinkling* upon them. 3. As to the Cloud, the Hiſtory is very particular and expreſs about it, the *one* Side of it was very *dark*, and the *other* Side was very *light*, as a bright *Pillar* of *Fire*: And it was the *bright*, *clear Side*, that was towards the *Iſraelites*. Exod. 14. 19, 20. *And the Angel of God, which went before the Camp of* Iſrael, *removed and went behind them, and the Pillar of the Cloud went, from before their Face, and ſtood behind them. And it came between the Camp of the* Egyptians *and the Camp of* Iſrael; *and it was a Cloud and Darkneſs to them (to the* Egyptians) but it gave *Light by Night* to theſe (the *Iſraelites*)

ſo that here is not the *leaſt* Intimation of any *Droppings* of the Cloud, upon the *Iſraelites*, nor any rational Ground to believe, that it did *wet* them. For as the Text ſays, it was the *bright and light Side*, that was towards the *Iſraelites* to lead them comfortably thro' the Sea. And beſides what has been ſaid already, this *Alluſion* of the *Apoſtle*, does not neceſſarily imply, nor with any certainty denote, that the *Iſraelites* were *wet*, ſo much, as either in Regard to their *Feet*, or even as to their *outward Garments*. For the Strength of the *Alluſion* and of the *Apoſtle*'s *Reaſoning*, lies in *this*, *viz.* that as the *Iſraelites* were formerly ſufficiently encompaſſed with *Water*, having the Sea as *Walls* on each *Side* of them, and a *Cloud* of Water and Fire *above* them, they might be *figuratively* ſaid to be *baptized unto* Moſes. And 'tis in *Reſemblance* of this, that People now under the *Goſpel* are *plunged* into Water, and covered all *over* with Water, in *being baptized unto Jeſus Chriſt*. And before all impartial and equitable Judges, this will appear to be the *genuine*, and eaſy Meaning of the Paſſage. It makes evidently for the *Baptiſts*, in ſhewing that Perſons muſt be *plunged* or *overwhelm'd* in a ſufficient *Depth* of Water, when they ſubmit to this *Ordinance*. So that Mr. *W.* has loſt the moſt *famous* Inſtance, he thought to have retained, in Favour of the *Cauſe* of *ſprinkling* Infants.

IV. I come to his fourth Scripture-Conſequence, to prove Infant-Baptiſm, *p.* 20. which is thus, *viz. We are told that Chriſt during his Incarnation*,

carnation, welcomed Children to his Arms, bleſſed them, and declared them Subjects of his Kingdom; which, I think, is a ſufficient Indication of his Mind, that they ſhould be received into his Church by Baptiſm. I anſwer, the Text that he cites and refers to, is *Mark* 10. 13 ---- 16. for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.

1. It ſeems very clear from this Place, that 'tis the Kingdom of Glory, that is intended; for the Context runs thus *v.* 14, 15. *ſuffer the little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God Verily I ſay unto you, whoſoever ſhall not receive the Kingdom of God, as a little Child, he ſhall not enter therein.* The Baptiſts don't diſpute the Salvation of Infants. *Secret Things belong unto the Lord our God, but thoſe Things which are revealed. belong unto us and to our Children for ever*, Deut. 29. 29.

2. If I ſhould grant, that our *Lord* in ſpeaking of theſe *Children*, *Mat.* 19. 14. ſhould mean, the *Kingdom of Grace*; for the Text ſays, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, this would be of no Service to the *Pædobaptiſts*, for it would give Infants *a full Title* to *Church-Communion*, and the *Lord's-Supper*. For, will any People take Children into the *Kingdom* of Grace, and not give the poor *Babes* the *Food* of the Kingdom. This would look *unreaſonable* and very hard. Therefore, when Mr. *W.* ſo *zealouſly* pleads, *p.* 21. 22. *ſhall we reject them, whom Chriſt bids welcome? Or look upon them as unfit Members of the Church of Chriſt, whom he actually declares ſuch?* The Baptiſts may very juſtly anſwer in this Caſe,

why do you diſlike the Company of Infants at the Lord's Table? If they are fit for the Life of Angels above, ſurely they are fit, for the pureſt Ordinances and Societies here below; and ſo you may, if you pleaſe, practice accordingly. 3. the *very Circumſtance* of the Diſciples *oppoſing* the bringing, of *theſe Children* to *Chriſt*, is an Argument that they knew *Nothing* of Infant-Baptiſm, or elſe they would not *hinder* the bringing of them. And tho' our Lord had a *fair* Opportunity to mention their *Right* to Baptiſm, if any ſuch Thing had been in Practice, yet he ſays not *one* Word of the Matter, therefore 'tis to no Manner of Purpoſe, for any to pretend, to build *Infant-Baptiſm* on this Text.

V. I come to Mr. *W*'s Fifth Scripture-Conſequence, to prove the baptizing of Infants, and 'tis as follows *p.* 23. *The baptizing of Infants appears to me a neceſſary Conſequence, from the cutting off the* Jews *from, and admitting the* Gentiles *into Covenant with God, and to a Participation of the Priviledges of the Goſpel.* To which I anſwer, that the *Jews* were *cut off*, for their *Unbelief*, and *Rejection* of the *Meſſiah*, is readily allowed; but that the *Gentiles* were admitted, into the *Abrahamic* or *Moſaic* Covenant, in the Senſe and Latitude, that the *Jewiſh Nation* was, I abſolutely deny. Mr. *W.* ſhould have diſtinguiſhed, between thoſe *Priviledges* of the *Jews*, which the *Gentiles* were *let into*, and *thoſe* which they were *not let into.* Inſtead of *this*, he runs on, repeating, if *the Root be holy ſo are the Branches* p. 23. 24. As if every profeſſing *Maſter* in a *Gentile*

Gentile Family, was to be underſtood by this *Root*, and the *carnal* Seed of ſuch to be underſtood by theſe *holy Branches*.

This is a great *Miſtake*, that many *Pædobaptiſts* are brought up in, they are taught to think, that if a *Maſter* of a Family be a *Believer*, or a *Profeſſor*, that therefore he preſently ſtands in the *Capacity* of *Abraham* to his *Children*: That he is an *Abraham*, a *holy Root* from which *holy Branches* do naturally ſpring. This *Miſtake* leads them on, to look upon *themſelves* as *better* and *greater*, than they *really* are; and this prompts them to *plead* for ſome *Priviledges* to their Children, as if they had been all *ſanctified* from the Womb: they imagine that, becauſe *Abraham* had ſome ſpecial *Marks* of Favour, granted to his *Poſterity*, there ought to be ſome diſtinguiſhing *Prerogatives* belonging to their *Children*. 'Tis upon this *Foot* that they are ſo zealous to have *Baptiſm* come in the Room of *Circumciſion*. For they think, that becauſe *Circumciſion* was to be adminiſtred to the Children of *Abraham*, at *eight Days old*, there ſhould be ſomewhat done to their *Children*, much about the *ſame Age*. And 'tis evident that upon this *Plan* Mr. *W.* goes, when he endeavours, to accommodate thoſe Words, *Rom.* 11. 16. to believing Parents, *if the Root be holy, ſo are the Branches*. Whereas, by *Root* in this Place, is undoubtedly intended *Abraham*, and by *Branches* are meant the *Poſterity* of *Abraham*. And can any thing be more vain and aſſuming, than for every ordinary *Profeſſor* to think himſelf inveſted with the Dignity of *Abra-*

why do you diſlike the Company of Infants at the Lord's Table? If they are fit for the Life of Angels above, ſurely they are fit, for the pureſt Ordinances and Societies here below; and ſo you may, if you pleaſe, practice accordingly. 3. the *very Circumſtance* of the Diſciples *oppoſing* the bringing, of *theſe Children* to *Chriſt*, is an Argument that they knew *Nothing* of Infant-Baptiſm, or elſe they would not *hinder* the bringing of them. And tho' our Lord had a *fair* Opportunity to mention their *Right* to Baptiſm, if any ſuch Thing had been in Practice, yet he ſays not *one* Word of the Matter, therefore 'tis to no Manner of Purpoſe, for any to pretend, to build *Infant-Baptiſm* on this Text.

V. I come to Mr. *W*'s Fifth Scripture-Conſequence, to prove the baptizing of Infants, and 'tis as follows *p.* 23. *The baptizing of Infants appears to me a neceſſary Conſequence, from the cutting off the* Jews *from, and admitting the* Gentiles *into Covenant with God, and to a Participation of the Priviledges of the Goſpel.* To which I anſwer, that the *Jews* were *cut off*, for their *Unbelief*, and *Rejection* of the *Meſſiah*, is readily allowed; but that the *Gentiles* were admitted, into the *Abrahamic* or *Moſaic* Covenant, in the Senſe and Latitude, that the *Jewiſh Nation* was, I abſolutely deny. Mr. *W.* ſhould have diſtinguiſhed, between thoſe *Priviledges* of the *Jews*, which the *Gentiles* were *let into*, and *thoſe* which they were *not let into.* Inſtead of *this*, he runs on, repeating, if *the Root be holy ſo are the Branches* p. 23. 24. As if every profeſſing *Maſter* in a *Gentile*

Gentile Family, was to be underſtood by this *Root*, and the *carnal* Seed of ſuch to be underſtood by theſe *holy Branches*.

This is a great *Miſtake*, that many *Pædobaptiſts* are brought up in, they are taught to think, that if a *Maſter* of a Family be a *Believer*, or a *Profeſſor*, that therefore he preſently ſtands in the *Capacity* of *Abraham* to his *Children*: That he is an *Abraham*, a *holy Root* from which *holy Branches* do naturally ſpring. This *Miſtake* leads them on, to look upon *themſelves* as *better* and *greater*, than they *really* are; and this prompts them to *plead* for ſome *Priviledges* to their Children, as if they had been all *ſanctified* from the Womb: they imagine that, becauſe *Abraham* had ſome ſpecial *Marks* of Favour, granted to his *Poſterity*, there ought to be ſome diſtinguiſhing *Prerogatives* belonging to their *Children*. 'Tis upon this *Foot* that they are ſo zealous to have *Baptiſm* come in the Room of *Circumciſion*. For they think, that becauſe *Circumciſion* was to be adminiſtred to the Children of *Abraham*, at *eight Days old*, there ſhould be ſomewhat done to their *Children*, much about the *ſame Age*. And 'tis evident that upon this *Plan* Mr. *W.* goes, when he endeavours, to accommodate thoſe Words, *Rom.* 11. 16. to believing Parents, *if the Root be holy, ſo are the Branches*. Whereas, by *Root* in this Place, is undoubtedly intended *Abraham*, and by *Branches* are meant the *Poſterity* of *Abraham*. And can any thing be more vain and aſſuming, than for every ordinary *Profeſſor* to think himſelf inveſted with the Dignity of *Abra-*

ham, and to imagine, that the Scripture gives us Leave, to call *ſuch* a *Profeſſor*, a *holy Root*, and his *natural* Seed, *holy Branches?*

Whereas we are ſaid to *be born, like wild Aſſes Colts*, Job. 11. 12. *and are all equally* concluded *under Sin, and are openly declared to be by Nature Children of Wrath, even like others*, Eph. 2. 3.

Therefore, I would endeavour, farther to clear up this Matter, in the following Obſervations.

1. Believing *Gentile* Parents themſelves, are but *Branches* upon this Root; ſo that they are not, cannot be the *Root itſelf*. The Apoſtle is expreſs as to this, Rom. 11. 17, 18. *And if ſome of the Branches be broken off, and thou being a wild Olive Tree wert grafted in among them, and with them partakeſt of the Root and Fatneſs of the Olive-Tree, boaſt not again the Branches, but if thou boaſt, thou beareſt not the Root, but the Root thee.*

2. The *believing* Children, of ſinful *Gentile* Parents, are as good *Branches*, as any *others*, upon *this Root*, and are equally intereſted in it, and grafted upon it. v. 20. *thou ſtandeſt by Faith.*

3. As to the *unregenerate, unbelieving* Offspring of *Gentile* Parents, they have no *Communication* with this *Root*, nor any *Claim* to it. They are not the *natural Branches* of it, neither are they *ingrafted Branches into it*; for the Goſpel requires *true Faith* in order to become of the *Stock of* Abraham. So that Mr. *W*'s arguing after this Manner, is of no Force at all, to favour the Cauſe of *Infant-Baptiſm*, both *Root* and *Branch* being *ill grounded*, and will bear no Weight at all.

But

But, he hopes to have ſome Relief, from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. Where he tells us, *that the Children of one believing Parent are holy, which Holineſs he thinks not only qualifies them for, but entitles them to Baptiſm.* I anſwer, the Text is read thus, *for the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified by the Husband, elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.* In order to take in the Apoſtle's Meaning in this Place, we muſt advert to the Scope and Aim of the Context. The greateſt Part of the Chapter is taken up, in treating about Marriage, or ſome Circumſtances belonging to the conjugal State: In the 12 and 13 Verſes, the Apoſtle exhorts and determines, that if any were married in a State of *Hetheniſm*, and that the Husband was converted afterwards to *Chriſtianity*, he was by *no Means* to put away his Wife, if ſhe remain'd an *Infidel*; provided ſhe was willing to live with him: On the other Hand, if the Wife was converted to *Chriſtianity*, and the Husband remain'd an *Infidel*, ſhe was by *no Means* to leave him, if he was pleaſed to dwell with her. So that the Goſpel does not ſeperate Husband and Wife, merely becauſe the one is a *Believer* and the other an *Unbeliever*. But they are *ſanctified* by one another, and to one another, in the honourable State of Marriage, an *Ordinance* appointed by *God himſelf*. Otherwiſe ſays the *Apoſtle, if it was abſolutely unlawful, for a Believer to cohabit with an Unbeliever, what Confuſion would enſue, how many Marriages muſt be diſſolved! And the Children reckon'd no better than Baſtards,*

Baſtards, an unclean Breed, i. e. *begot and born in Uncleanneſs!* But upon the Parents keeping together, in *Conjugal* Affection and Union, notwithſtanding any *Difference* in Religion, their Children will be look'd upon as *holy* in a *civil Senſe*, as being the *Iſſue* of a lawful Bed, according to an *Ordinance* of God. And tho' *this Text* has been often warp'd and wreſted ſince the *Reformation*, to mean a *Jewiſh Holineſs*, yet according to the Context, and the common Rules of Interpretation, 'tis down-right *Legitimacy*, is intended in this Place. But, I may add theſe following Obſervations. 1. If it be granted Mr. *W.* and the Pædobaptiſts, that 'tis, *ſeminal* or *fæderal* Holineſs is intended here, all this is very remote from *Infant-Baptiſm*. Since there is nothing can be fairly inferr'd from the Text or the Scope of it, as looking that Way, for of what Advantage ſoever this ſuppoſed *Holineſs* may be to the *Children*, yet 'tis not ſo much as ſuggeſted that it *entitles* them to Baptiſm.

2. If this *ſeminal* Holineſs of the Children gives them a *Right* to Ordinances, why may not the *fæderal Sanctification* of the *unbelieving* Wife, entitle *her* to both *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's-Supper*, for *ſhe is ſaid to be ſanctified by her Husband?* and all the World will allow, that a *Wife* is as *near* a-kin to the *Husband*, as a *Child*; and therefore there is a plain Parity of Reaſon, why the *believing* Husband ſhould impart *equal* Qualifications to the *one* as to the *other*.

Thus I have carefully examin'd, Mr. *W*'s Ground-Work; or *Foundation* that he has attempted

tempted to lay in Scripture, for *Infant-Baptiſm:* Firſt from Precept or Command, ſecondly from Precedent or Example, and thirdly from good Conſequence; and upon a full and impartial Examination, there is not *one* of theſe *three* Things, to be found in the *holy Scriptures.* What Succeſs he has met with hitherto, gives very little Hopes of the remaining Part of his Book; for if there be neither Command, Example nor Conſequence, in Support of Infant-Baptiſm, 'tis left in a very defenceleſs and *weak* Condition.

Mr. *W.* proceeds to anſwer ſome Objections of the *Baptiſts*, againſt the Practice of *baptizing Infants.* And, I wonld only remark, as I paſs along, that he ſtates theſe Objections in a very imperfect Manner, *i. e.* as he thinks fit. However ſuch as they are, I ſhall attend to them.

I. The firſt Objection he puts thus, *viz. It is objected againſt Infant-Baptiſm, there is no expreſs Command for, nor clear Example of it, in the New Teſtament.* He might have added, when his Hand was in, *nor any good Conſequence.* For he has been toiling hard, to find *all*, or even *one*, of *theſe* Things, but has hitherto met with nothing but Diſappointment. He tells us, *that Part of this Objection, goes upon a Suppoſition, that nothing ought to be practiſed* by Chriſtians, but what is commanded in ſo *many expreſs Words, whereas the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm, admit Women to the Lord's Supper, for which they have no litteral Command. And many of them keep the firſt Day of the Week, as the Chriſtian Sabbath.*

Mr.

Mr. *W.* thinks, by this Way of Reaſoning, to turn the Edge of this Objection, againſt the Baptiſts, by puzzling them with the Caſe of *Women's* coming to the *Lord's Table*, and the *Obſervance* of the *firſt Day* of the Week. But, I hope to make it very plain to the Reader, that there is a vaſt *Diſparity* between the Inſtances, which he ſuppoſes to be *Parallel.*

For 1. as to *Women's* coming to the *Lord's Table*, there are no Qualifications required of them, but what are very conſiſtent with their State; whereas in Point of *Baptiſm*, there are Faith and Repentance required every where, the Want of which altogether diſqualifies *Infants*, and excludes them, this Ordinance, if we keep to the Rules of the Goſpel. 2. To put the Matter out of Doubt, we have a clear Account of *Women's* having commun'd at *breaking* of *Bread*, with the *Church at* Jeruſalem, Acts 1. 13, 14. *And when they were come in, they went up into an upper Room, where abode both* Peter *and* James, *and* John *and* Andrew *and* Philip, *and* Thomas, Bartholomew *and* Matthew, James *the Son of* Alpheus, Simon Zelotes, *and* Judas *the Brother of* James. *Theſe all continued, with one Accord in Prayer and Supplication with the Women, and* Mary *the Mother of* Jeſus, v. 15. ---- *the Number of the Names together, were about an hundred and twenty.* Ch. 2. v. 42, *and they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and Fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers.* v. 44. *and all that believed were together.* ---- v. 46. *and they continuing daily with one Accord in the Temple*

an

and breaking of Bread from Houſe to Houſe, v. 47. *and the Lord added daily to the Church ſuch as ſhould be ſaved.* Now if Mr. *W.* can produce, but a Quarter-Part of ſuch a Scripture-Hiſtory of *Infants* being *baptized*, I promiſe freely, to be of his Opinion. Again, as to the Buſineſs of the *Obſervance* of the *firſt Day* of the Week, we have the Rule of the *Apoſtles*, and of the *Churches*, meeting, to perform ſome of the moſt *ſolemn Duties*, and *Acts* of *Worſhip*, on that Day. Acts 20. 7. *And upon the firſt Day of the Week, when the Diſciples came together to break Bread*, Paul *preached unto them.* 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. *Now concerning the Collection for the Saints, as I have given Orders to the Churches of* Galatia, *even ſo do ye. Upon the firſt Day of the Week, let every one of you lay by him in ſtore, as God has proſpered him, that there be no Gatherings when I come.*

Now, let Mr. *W.* give ſuch evident *Examples* of the Practice of *Infant-Baptiſm*, and I ſhall be fully ſatisfied for my Part. For the *Baptiſts* pay as much Deference to the Authority of *Scripture-Precedents*, as he can pretend to do.

II. The ſecond Objection that Mr. *W.* ſtates, is thus, *viz. It is commonly ſaid that Repentance and Faith are neceſſary to Baptiſm*: to which he anſwers after this Manner, *that in adult Perſons, who have been guilty of actual Sins, againſt the Law of God; Repentance is neceſſary to qualify for Baptiſm.* And a little lower in the ſame Page, *the Want of it (Repentance) would render an adult*

adult Perſon, unfit for that holy Ordinance. Here I would aſk Mr. *W.* ſome Queſtions, as,

1. How is this Conceſſion, *viz. that Repentance is neceſſary to qualify the adult for Baptiſm*, reconcileable to what he has advanced before, p. 9, 10. where he has been attempting with all his Might, to put *baptizing*, before *teaching*, in the Words of the Commiſſion. Nay, he has been endeavouring to precipitate all Nations to Baptiſm, without any regard to any Knowledge, Faith, or Repentance at all. Again, how will this comport with his Opinion, p. 12. where he tells the Reader, *that upon the Converſion of the Heads of a Family, the whole Houſe may be baptized, if there be none in it that refuſe Baptiſm.* Can theſe Doctrines ſtand together? or where ſhall we believe Mr. *W.* and find his *Principle*, if he has any? in the *Beginning*, or *Middle*, or *End* of his Book? ſince he is ſo very unaccountably inconſiſtent with himſelf.

2. Where does the Diſtinction appear in the Word of God, between the Qualifications of the *Adult*, and the Qualifications of *Infants* for *Baptiſm?* for he tells us, *that Infants have not been guilty of actual Sins, ſo that there is no need of Repentance on their Part, and therefore their being incapable of exerciſing Repentance, does by no means incapacitate them for Baptiſm.* Does he think that his bold Aſſertion, and *bare ipſe dixit*, will ſatisfy the Conſciences of People, who are *daily ſearching the Scriptures, whether things are ſo or no.*

3. Does

3. Does Mr. *W.* believe, that Infant-Baptiſm can waſh away original Sin? when he ſays, *therefore they are baptized, that the Uncleanneſs of their Birth may be purged away, according to* Origen's *Argument of Infant-Baptiſm*, p. 52. if he does not believe it, his Employment is ſo much the more baſe, and unworthy, in endeavouring to inſtill this ſottiſh and dangerous Notion of *Origen*, into the Minds of divers honeſt People, in his own Congregation and elſewhere.

As to his ſtarting any pretended Difficulties, in Regard to our *Saviour's* ſubmitting to *John's Baptiſm*; the Scripture expreſsly determines our *Lord's* direct *End* in ſo doing, 'twas to fulfil that Part of *Righteouſneſs* and *Obedience*, that he owed to the Father, and to give a Pattern, of all dutiful Submiſſion to divine Ordinances, *Matt.* iii. 15. for, *tho' he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience. Heb.* v. 8. But, there is ſomething more than common Inadvertency, wrapt up in Mr. *W's* Words, p. 31. which are theſe, *viz. Now if John required of all that came to his Baptiſm Confeſſion of Sin, and yet for good Reaſons baptized Chriſt, who had no Sins to confeſs, why may not we admit Infants to Baptiſm without Repentance, when they have done nothing to repent of?* Would he offer here, to compare the *unclean* and *guilty Offspring of Adam*, to the immaculate *Lamb of God?* Are the *Infants* of the *Apoſtate Race*, (tho' profeſſing Parents) upon a *Parity of Reaſon*, to be admitted to the *ſacred things of God*, with the bleſſed *Mediator* himſelf? This is a ſurprizing Flight of Zeal indeed,

indeed, to make way for *Infant-Baptiſm!* As to what he urges from Dr. *Whitby* in the ſame Page, *viz. that they who hence conclude, that Infants are not capable of Baptiſm (for want of Faith) muſt alſo conclude they cannot be ſaved; Faith being more expreſly required as neceſſary to Salvation, than Baptiſm.* I anſwer that Dr. *Whitby* and himſelf agree, that *Infants* may be ſaved without *Faith*, without *Repentance*, and without the *Lord's Supper*, and pray what is the Reaſon that they may not be ſaved, upon the ſame Ground, without *Baptiſm?*

III. Mr. *W*'s 3d Objection is ſtated thus, *viz. It is often ſaid that Children are not capable of underſtanding the Nature of that Covenant, into which they are entred by Baptiſm, nor of giving Conſent to it, and therefore baptizing Infants, is Cozening inſtead of Chriſtianing of them.* To which Mr. *W.* anſwers, *that Infants are as capable of underſtanding the Nature of the Covenant they are entred into, by Baptiſm, as the Jewiſh Infants were of underſtanding that Covenant, into which they were entred by Circumciſion.* 'Tis ſufficient by way of Reply, for me to obſerve, that this Objection is in a great Meaſure of his own making, for the Baptiſts have no need, to lay any ſtreſs upon ſuch a way of reaſoning? but if he can produce, ſo good a Warrant from Scripture, to enter Children into Covenant by Baptiſm, as there was for entring of them by Circumciſion, the Baptiſts will promiſe to have done objecting againſt the Practice.

As

As for his Way of arguing from the Principle of Reaſon and Nature, to inſtituted Worſhip, as he does p. 33, 34, 35. And by ſuch Deductions, to ſhew the natural Right that Parents have to baptize their Children, this Method is ſo *notoriouſly* weak and fallacious, that I utterly reject it, as foreign to the Purpoſe, and not to be allowed in the Diſpute in Hand.

Chap. V.

More Objections as propos'd by Mr. W. *conſider'd. His Reaſons againſt* John's *Baptiſm of no Weight. The Difference between the* Baptiſm *of* John, *and* that *enjoin'd by our Lord in the* Commiſſion. *The ſuppoſed Re-baptization* Acts 19. *with the Reaſons* pro *and* con. *ſtated, and left to the Reader's Judgemnt. Divers Paſſages from the late learned Dr.* Gale, *vindicated from Mr.* W's *Exceptions.*

IV. THE fourth Objection, as ſtated by Mr. *W.* is thus, p. 35. *John the Baptiſt baptized none but adult Perſons; and Chriſt himſelf was not baptized 'till he was* 30 *Years old; conſequently ſay ſome, none but adult Perſons ought to be baptized.* This is another lame Objection, of his own framing; and he does prudently to tell us, *they are but ſome particular People that urge it.* However he goes on, to acquaint the Reader that *'tis partly founded on* Mat. 3. 6. *where we are told that* Jeruſalem, *and all* Judea, *were baptized of him (meaning* John*) in* Jordan *confeſſing their Sins.* But Mr. *W.* does by no Means approve of *John*'s Baptiſm, for he ſays, *'twas only to prepare Perſons for the Kingdom of the* Meſſiah, *and not deſign'd to be the Chriſtian's Pattern; and he offers three Reaſons to prove it.*

1. *The*

1. The firſt Reaſon is this, *that if* John *requir'd any Profeſſion of Faith at all, in the Perſons he baptized, it was only the Belief of the* Meſſiah *to come.* Does Mr. *W.* doubt, whether *John* requir'd any Confeſſion of Faith? When the Scriptures teſtify, that he required open *Confeſſion of Sin,* and a *Profeſſion of true Repentance.* Can there be a rational, penitent Confeſſion of Sin, without a Declaration of Faith in the Mercy of God? Beſides Mr. *W.* acknowledges, that *John* did baptize People into the Belief of the *Meſſiah* to come, p. 36. what can he call this, but a Confeſſion of *Faith?*

2. His ſecond Reaſon againſt *John*'s Baptiſm, is, *that he did not baptize in the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt, as well as the Father.* But how will Mr. *W.* reconcile this, to what he allows in his firſt Reaſon, where he grants, that *John*'s Baptiſm was unto the Belief of the *Meſſiah* to come? Was not the *Meſſiah* or *Chriſt,* and the *Son of God* the very ſame Perſonage?

3. His third Reaſon againſt *John*'s Baptiſm, is this, *that ſome adult Perſons baptized by* John *or his Diſciples, were baptized over again, by St.* Paul, Acts 19. 5. *So that if* John's *Baptiſm be the Chriſtian Pattern, Re-baptiſing is lawful.* I anſwer in the following Manner, 1. As to the Perſons baptized *Acts* 19. 5. he need not have told us, *they were adult,* for the Goſpel is clear that neither *John* nor *Paul,* nor any one elſe recorded therein, ever meddled with the baptizing of Infants. 2. If there was a *notorious Error,* or the *Omiſſion* of ſome thing *eſſential* to Baptiſm,

then 'twas not *proper Chriſtian* Baptiſm; ſo that it was, not only lawful, but neceſſary to repeat the Act, in order to come at the due Adminiſtration of the Ordinance; for if ſome illy qualified Diſciples of *John*, had not performed the Work as it ſhould be, and that *Paul* thought it neceſſary to mend it, what Ground is there to find Fault with ſuch a Repetition of the Action, to render the whole compleat? *Cyprian* was ſo far from admitting the Baptiſm of *Hereticks*, that he openly pleaded for the re-baptizing of all thoſe, who had been *before* baptized by heretical Hands, and cites this Paſſage, *Acts* 19, for his Authority ſo to do. Indeed he is not willing that theſe Perſons ſhould be looked upon as re-baptiz'd, becauſe the Baptiſm of Hereticks ought to be eſteem'd null and void. By Help of which Expedient, he would wipe off the *Odium* of Re-baptization. But 'tis evident beyond Contradiction, to any one that looks into the Works of *Cyprian*, that he has no leſs than three Epiſtles wherein he defends the baptizing again, of ſuch, as had been once baptized by Hereticks, *viz.* the *one Epiſtle* to *Januarius*, the *other* to *Quintus*, and the *third* to *Jubaianus*. His Words are theſe; " * *But we ſay, that they who come from them, are* " *not re-baptized with us, only baptized.*

---

* Nos autem dicimus, eos qui inde veniunt, non rebaptizari apud nos, ſed baptizari. *Cyprian.* Ep. 71. ad Quint. Edit. *Pariſ.* 1643.

And

And a little further he adds, " † *I know not* " *how ſome of our Fraternity are led haſtily to be-* " *lieve, that they who have been baptized among* " *Hereticks, when they come over to us, ought not* " *to be baptized again.*

And in his Ep. to *Jubaianus* he reaſons thus, " || *Nor will Hereticks refuſe to be baptized with* " *us, with the lawful and true Baptiſm of the* " *Church, when they learn from us, that ſuch were* " *baptized by* Paul, *who had been before baptized* " *with the Baptiſm of* John; *as we read in the* " *Acts of the Apoſtles. And there are ſome of our* " *Friends, who aſſert the Baptiſm of Hereticks to* " *be valid, and eſteem it a Crime to baptize any* " *again after the Enemies of God, out of a Sort of* " *Hatred againſt re-baptizing.*

The Reader may find, in the ſame Edition referred to already, of this *Father*, an Account of a *Carthaginian Council*, wherein 87 *Biſhops* voted publickly for *Anabaptiſm*, in the proper *Senſe* of that Word, tho' they did not like the *Term*. ibid. p. 395, 396, 397.

---

† Neſcio etenim quâ præſumptione, ducuntur quidam de Collegis noſtris, ut putent, eos qui apud Hæreticos tincti ſunt, quando ad nos veniunt, baptizari non oportere. Ibid.

|| Nec recuſabunt baptizari apud nos Hæretici, legitimo & vero Eccleſiæ Baptiſmo, quando ex nobis didicerint, baptizatos quoque a *Paulo*, eos qui jam Baptiſmo *Joannis* baptizati fuiſſent. Sicut legimus in actibus Apoſtolum. Et nunc apud quoſdam de noſtris, Hæreticorum baptiſma occupatum aſſeritur, & invidiâ quadam quaſi re-baptizandi, baptizare poſt hoſtes Dei, nefas ducitur. *Cyp.* Ep. 73. ad *Jubaian.*

3. There is ſomething very difficult to be determined in this Point, and that is whether theſe Perſons mentioned here, were in Fact re-baptized or not. I am ſatisfied there is no Body can prove that they were. And there are very probable Conſiderations, to induce us to believe that they were not. And 'tis certain that divers learned Pædobaptiſts utterly diſclaim any Re-baptization in this Place.

The *Dutch* Annotations, are abſolutely againſt Re-baptizing, and explain the Paſſage thus, "* *Theſe are the Words of* Paul, *relating how* "John *baptized his Diſciples, which appears from* "*the* Greek *Text, in which the two Particles* "(Men) *that is* indeed, *and* (de) *that is* but *or* and "*(whereof the one goeth before in the fourth Verſe,* "*and the other followeth in the fifth Verſe) ſhew* "*that the Things which are ſaid in theſe two* "*Verſes, muſt be joined together, and that one and* "*the ſame Perſon and Thing is ſpoken of.*" So that from hence it cannot be proved, that theſe Diſciples ſhould be re-baptiz'd by *Paul.*

* And *Wollebius* in his Compendium, ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion, where he ſays thus, "† *Nor can it be gathered from the Text,* "*that theſe were re-baptized; for theſe Words in* "*the fifth* verſe *are not of* Luke *concerning* Paul, *but* "*of* Paul *concerning* John *and his Diſciples: This*

* See *Dutch* Annot. on *Acts* 19 *v.* 5.

† Nec tamen ex textu illos re-baptizatos eſſe colligitur: Verba enim illa *v.* 5. non ſunt Lucæ de *Paulo* ſed *Pauli* de *Joanne* & diſcipulis ejus. Nihil igitur favet hic locus vel *Papiſtis* vel *Anabaptiſtis. Woll.* Comp. de Bapt.

"*Place*

‘ *Place therefore, does not any Way favour either* “ *the* Papiſts *or* Anabaptiſts.

The Reaſons brought to ſupport this Opinion are not to be deſpiſed. As, that we have no Account of *John's Baptiſm* being mended in any other Inſtances, and that *John* and his *Diſciples* baptized many *Thouſands* may be eaſily allowed, but *none* of them were baptized *again*, except theſe *ſuppoſed twelve*, for the Number was no *more*, as appears from *v.* 7. of this 19th Chap. *And all the Men were about twelve.* But what ſeems moſt conſiderable, to make the Senſe of this Paſſage not to be underſtood of re-baptizing, is this, that perhaps the Hiſtory reads more *natural*, as introducing the Words, declaring *John's Manner* of baptizing, according to *Paul's Account*, than declaring *Paul's re-baptizing* of them, according to the Account of *Luke*, who was the *Penman* of the *Acts*. If it be *Paul's* continued and uninterrupted Speech, from the Beginning of the *fourth* to the *End* of the *fifth* Verſe, then the Caſe is plain, they were *not re-baptized.* The Reader may judge as he thinks fit, the Text runs thus. *Then ſaid* Paul, John *verily baptized with the Baptiſm of Repentance, ſaying unto the People that they ſhould believe on him, which ſhould come after him, that is on* Chriſt Jeſus. *And when they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord* Jeſus.

I would obſerve further, that it would be very unjuſt to charge *John* with not having train'd up his Diſciples in the Knowledge and Belief of the Holy Ghoſt. For he conſtantly tought the

Doctrine of the *Holy Spirit.* Mat. 3. 11. *I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I ---- heſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire.* John 1. 32, 33. *and* John *bare Record, ſaying, I ſaw the Spirit deſcending from Heaven, like a Dove, and it abode upon him. ---- But he that ſent me to baptize with Water, the ſame ſaid unto me, upon whom thou ſhalt ſee the Spirit deſcending and remaining on him, the ſame is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghoſt.* So that the moſt probable Conjecture in Regard to *theſe People, Acts* 19. ſeems to be, that they did not know any thing of the *Holy Ghoſt* in his *extraordinary Gifts* poured forth. And in this Senſe purely, the *Dutch Annotations* take the Place.

And indeed, all that is certain, of what *Paul* did to *theſe* Perſons at *Epheſus*, is, that *when he laid his Hands upon them, the* Holy Ghoſt *came upon them.* And whoſoever examines the Paſſage, and weighs theſe Conſiderations calmly and without Prejudice, will find Reaſon little enough to conclude, that there was any *Re-baptization* in the Caſe. So that Mr. *W.* might very well have ſpared an impotent *Fling*, or an inſipid *Pun* upon *John* the *Baptiſt*, when he tells us, p. 38, *that the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm have made but an indifferent Choice of a Patron, if they aſſume to themſelves, the Name of Baptiſts, becauſe* John *was called the Baptiſt.* As to the Name *(Baptiſt)* 'twas given him by the *Holy Ghoſt*, if Mr. *W.* does not like it, he may reject it. As to *John*'s Baptiſm, 'twas according to the

Counſel

Counſel of God, and our Saviour ſubmitted to it, and confirmed it, as to the *Subject* and *Mode* of it, by his own publick *Commiſſion*, to be an *everlaſting Ordinance* in his *Church*. As to the *Difference* between the *Baptiſm of John*, and the *Baptiſm* adminiſtred by the *Diſciples* and *Apoſtles* of our *Lord*, after the Delivery of the *Commiſſion*, it ſeems to conſiſt in *this*; *John* baptized to Repentance and in the Belief of *Chriſt*, who was to appear to the World in due Time. The ſet *Form* of *Words*, in the *Adminiſtration*, being not punctually recorded. But *the Apoſtles* after they received the Commiſſion, baptiz'd on *Profeſſion* of Repentance, and Faith, *in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt*, having a ſet *Form* of Words of Adminiſtration *preſcribed* to them. But the ſame *adult Subjects*, and the ſame *Mode* of *Dipping*, were to be continued to the *End* of the World, without any *Variation*, that we read of. So that the *true* Ground of Mr. *W*'s *Uneaſineſs* and Diſſatisfaction at *John*'s *Baptiſm*, is *this*, becauſe he can't find the leaſt Pretence, nor any Shadow of Reaſon to alledge, that ever *John* baptized *Infants*, or that he *ſprinkled* any *adult*, for the Scripture is ſo plain, in relating the Circumſtances of *John*'s Baptiſm, that it carries ſtrong Conviction with it, that *only* the *adult* were concerned in it, and that to them *alone* it was adminiſtred: And the Act was performed under the *open Heavens*, in the *River Jordan*, in *Enon*, and other *Rivulets* where was *much Water*, that there is no Room left to doubt of the *Dipping* of thoſe Perſons. No Intimation

tion in the leaſt, of a *Mother* or *Nurſe* with any Infant in her Arms, attended with a *Baſon* of Water, in any private *Apartment*. *Theſe* are *Things* brought into *Faſhion* ſince that Time. And this is what ruffles our *Author*, and puts him ſo much out of *Humour*, with *John* the *Baptiſt*, and his Way of *Adminiſtration*. For he hoped to perſwade the World, that our *Lord* in his Commiſſion had altered the very *Nature of Baptiſm*, both as to the *Subject* and *Mode*, and had ordered a *new* Way, on Purpoſe to introduce the Practice of *ſprinkling* Infants: But let all impartial People read the New Teſtament, and compare the Practice of the *Apoſtles* and the *Apoſtolic Churches*, with the *Commiſſion of our Lord*, for they are the beſt *Interpreters* of it, and they will find *Things*, as I repreſent them to be. I may further add, that if the *Tranſlators* of our *Bible* had done Juſtice, as they in ſome *other Countries* have done, in rendring the Words, *Baptiſt* and *Baptiſm*, in *plain Engliſh Dipper* and *Dipping*, I am of Opinion, it would have prevented many *tedious* Diſputes, and that this Ordinance of *Chriſt* would have been *better* underſtood, and *better* treated than it is, by many *well Meaning* People in this *Nation*, who either through Ignorance, or rather the *Prejudice of Education* now trample upon it.

It remains ſtill, that I conſider Mr. *W*'s Way of ſtating the other Part of the Objection, *p.* 38. *viz.* Chriſt's being baptized at 30 Years of Age: And he tells us a little lower, *that if the Baptiſts think this Example binding, wky do they baptize*

tize any before they have attained to the Age of Thirty? I anſwer that this Way of arguing is deviſed by himſelf, he raiſes *Batteries* at his own Pleaſure, and then throws them down as he thinks fit; I know of no *Baptiſts*, who reaſon in ſo trifling a Manner, and therefore I need take no further Notice of it. But what he hints in the next Paragraph is pleaſant enough, *viz. that one Reaſon why they (the Baptiſts) defer Baptiſm, is, becauſe they require a Confeſſion of Faith from the Perſon to be baptized.* He may aſſure himſelf that this is the fixed Principle of the Baptiſts, and they endeavour to practice in Conformity to the *Apoſtolic Church*, the pureſt and moſt unexceptionable *Pattern.* And Mr. *W.* if he pleaſes may read the Qualifications of *thoſe Days*, when the Streſs was laid on *Faith in Chriſt*, in Order to fit the *Perſon* for Baptiſm. *Acts* 8. 36, 37.----*What doth hinder me to be baptized? And* Philip *ſaid, if thou believeſt with all thine Heart thou mayeſt.*----And *Tertullian* about two hundred Years afterwards ſeem'd to be much of the ſame Opinion. Eſpecially ſpeaking of this Inſtance in his Book of Baptiſm, where he is exhorting Perſons to be very cautious to whom they adminiſter Baptiſm, leſt it be given to thoſe who are unfit for it, and unworthy of it; he has theſe Words, " * *Give not holy Things to Dogs, and* " *caſt not your Pearl before Swine, and lay not*

" *Hands*

* Nolite dare ſanctum Canibus, & porcis projicere Margaritam veſtram, & manus ne facile impoſueris, ne participes

" *Hands ſuddenly on any, leſt you be Partakers of*
" *their Sins. For if* Philip *ſo eaſily baptized the*
" *Eunuch, let us remember, that the manifeſt*
" *Worthineſs of our Lord interpoſed in that Caſe;*
" *the Holy Ghoſt commanded* Philip *to go before*
" *handthat Way, and the Eunuch himſelf was not*
" *found idle, nor did he deſire to be raſhly baptized,*
" *but had been at the Temple to pray, and his Mind*
" *being impreſſed with the holy Scripture; ſuch*
" *a one ought to be received, to whom God ſent the*
" *Apoſtle, whom the holy Spirit commanded to*
" *join himſelf unto the Charriot, the Scripture*
" *readily occurs to his Belief, he is taken and in-*
" *ſtructed in due Time, the Lord is manifeſted to*
" *him, his Faith admits of no Delay, Water is*
" *not wanting, and the Apoſtle having finiſhed the*
" *Work, is caught away,* &c.

And in very few Lines further, *Tertullian* declares himſelf againſt giving Baptiſm to *Infants*, and indeed he was againſt adminiſtrating it to any young wanton People, 'till they ſhould

---

participes aliena delicta; ſi *Philippus* tam facilè tinxit Eunuchum, recogitemus, manifeſtam & exertam dignationem Domini interceſſiſſe. Spiritus *Philippo* præceperat in eam viam prætendere, ſpado & ipſe inventus eſt non otioſus, nec qui ſubito tingi concupiſceret: Sed ad Templum orandi gratia profectus, Scripturæ divinæ impreſſus; ſic oportebat deprendi, cui ultro Deus Apoſtolum miſerat, quem rurſus Spiritus ut ſe Curriculo Eunuchi adjungeret, juſſit. Scriptura ipſius Fidei occurrit, in tempore exhortatus adſumitur, Dominus oſtenditur, fides non moratur, aqua non expectatur, Apoſtolus perfecto negotio, eripitur, &c. *Tertul.* Lib. de Bapt. p. 710. Edit. *Baſil.* 1562.

appear

appear to be *grave*, and ſeriouſly diſpos'd for this *Solemn Ordinance*, and 'tis certain that this was the *original Intent* of *holy Baptiſm*, not only in the Judgment of this *Author*, but in the concurrent Senſe of the *firſt Ages of Chriſtianity*, as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew, in ſome good Meaſure, hereafter.

V. I paſs on to the fifth Objection as ſtated by Mr. *W.* p. 48. which is thus, *viz. It is objected that if Infants have a Right to Baptiſm, they have alſo a Right to the Lord's Supper. And if we admit them to one Ordinance, we ought not to exclude them from the other.* He pretends to make a *Triſle* of this Objection, in the following Paragraph, in his Book; to which I reply, that this *Objection*, has juſtly puzzled the moſt skilful Advocates for Infant-Baptiſm; the *Nature* of Things, and the *Qualifications* required to partake of *both* the Ordinances, in the Goſpel, *plead aloud*, that the *Subjects* who are admitted to the *one*, were always admitted to the *other*, ever ſince our Lord's Aſcenſion. Let Mr. *W.* diſprove it if he can. I have ſhewn already that in the Church at *Jeruſalem*, and in all other Churches, where we have an Account of the Diſcipline of the Apoſtles, Men and Women were baptized and admitted to Chriſtian Fellowſhip, *i. e.* in *breaking of Bread* at the Lord's Supper. And the *African Churches* in this Point, acted very conſiſtent with themſelves, for when they admitted *Infant-Baptiſm* between the *ſecond* and *third* Century, they alſo pleaded for *Infant-Communion*, and urged the Neceſſity of it.

And

And indeed there was an Uniformity in what they did, for there was as *much Reaſon* and as *much Scripture* to the full, for the *one* as for the *other*. 'Tis not to be denied, but that *Cyprian* was as zealous for *communicating* Infants, as for *baptizing of them*. There are *two* Paſſages in his Book *de Lapſis*, that will demonſtratively prove this. The Infants who had been uſed to be carried by their Parents to the *Lord's-Supper*, were it ſeems carried by 'em to *idolatrous Feaſts*, and therefore they are repreſented, as in the *Day* of Judgment, *exclaiming* againſt their *Parents* for *ſo doing*, in theſe Words, "* *We did nothing of this,* " *nor did we forſake the Meat and Cup of our Lord,* " *and hurry of our own Accord to partake of theſe* " *profane Pollutions. 'Twas the Unfaithfulneſs of* " *others that deſtroyed us, we eſteem'd our Parents* " *to be our Murderers.*

And in a few Pages further, we have the famous Story of the little Girl, that refuſed the Sacramental Wine, told in the following Manner,

" † *Hear, ſays he, an Account of what fell* " *out, when I myſelf was preſent, and Witneſs* " *thereof. The Parents of a little Girl, being in a* " *Fright*

---

* Nos nihil fecimus, nec derelicto cibo & poculo Domini, ad profana contagia ſponte properavimus; perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes ſenſimus Parricidas. *Cyp.* de Lapſis. p. 240. Edit. *Pariſ.* 1643.

† Præſente ac teſte meipſo, accipite quid evenerit. Parentes forte fugientes dum trepidi minus ſuis conſulunt, ſub

" *Fright and flying away, were not ſo careful of*
" *her as they ſhould have been, left her behind*
" *them at Nurſe. The Nurſe carried the Child*
" *thus left to the Magiſtrates. They brought her*
" *to an Idol where much People flocked together,*
" *and becauſe ſhe was too young to eat Fleſh, they*
" *gave her Bread ſoaked in Wine, being what was*
" *left of the Sacrifice of thoſe poor Creatures;*
" *ſome Time after, her own Mother takes the*
" *Child again; but the Girl could no more ſhew*
" *nor tell the wicked Fact that had been done,*
" *than ſhe could before underſtand or hinder it.*
" *The Matter being not known, her Mother brought*

ſub nutricis alimento, parvulam filiam reliquerunt; relictam nutrix detulit ad Magiſtratus. Illi ei, ad Idolum quo populus confluebat, quod carnem necdum poſſet edere per ætatem, panem mero mixtum, quod tamen ipſum de immolatione pereuntium ſupererat, tradiderunt. Recepit filiam poſtmodum mater. Sed facinus puella commiſſum tam loqui & indicare non potuit, quam nec intelligere prius potuit, nec arcere. Ignoratione igitur obreptum eſt, ut ſacrificantibus nobis, eam ſecum Mater inferret. Sed enim puella mixta cum ſanctis, precis noſtræ & orationis impatiens, nunc ploratu concuti, nunc mentis æſtu coepit fluctuabunda jactari, & velut tortore cogente, quibus poterat indicijs conſcientiam facti, in ſimplicibus adhuc annis, rudis anima fatebatur. Ubi vero ſolemnibus adimpletis, calicem diaconus offerre præſentibus coepit, & accipientibus ceteris locus ejus advenit; faciem ſuam parvula inſtinctu divinæ Majeſtatis avertere, os labijs obturantibus premere, calicem recuſare. Perſtitit tamen diaconus, & reluctanti licet, de Sacramento calicis infudit, tunc ſequitur ſingultus & vomitus. In corpore atque ore violato Euchariſtia permanere non potuit. Sanctificatus in Domini ſanguine potus, de pollutis viſceribus erupit. *Cyp.* ibid. p. 244.

" *her*

" *her to us, as we were celebrating the Lord's-*
" *Supper. And the Girl being placed among the*
" *Saints, could not bear our Prayers and Suppli-*
" *cations, began now to ſhriek bitterly, and to be*
" *dreadfully toſſed and tormented in her Mind, and*
" *as if an Executioner was forcing a Confeſſion from*
" *her, ſhe in the ſimplicity of her Soul, acknow-*
" *ledged by all the Tokens ſhe could at that tender*
" *Age, the Conſciouſneſs of the Fact. The Conſe-*
" *cration of the Elements being over, the Deacon*
" *began to offer the Cup to thoſe who were preſent,*
" *and among others her Turn came; ſhe through*
" *a divine Inſtinct turn'd away her Face, ſhut her*
" *Mouth hard and faſt, refuſing the Cup. The*
" *Deacon perſiſted to give it her, and though ſhe*
" *reſiſted, yet he poured down by Force into her*
" *Throat, ſome of the Sacramental Wine. Imme-*
" *diately followed ſobbing and vomiting. The Eu-*
" *chariſt could not continue in a Body and Mouth*
" *ſo defiled with Idolatry. The Drink ſanctified*
" *in the Blood of our Lord, forced it's Way out of*
" *her polluted Bowels,* &c.

Here is the cleareſt Proof, that can be expected, that *Cyprian* gave the Lord's-Supper to Infants. So that if any Streſs can be laid upon his *giving Baptiſm* to them, the ſame Streſs may be laid upon his *giving the Euchariſt*; if his *Authority* be good in the *one*, 'tis good in the *other*. And if Mr. *W.* rejects the Practice of *Cyprian* in the Buſineſs of the *Lord's Supper*, why may not the *Baptiſts* reject his Practice of *baptizing Infants*, for the Scripture is equally a Stranger to *both theſe Things*. What I obſerve further is this, that

that these *Twin-Errors* seem to be equally *antient*; and *Cyprian* bids *faireſt*, to be the *firſt Father* who *openly* pleaded for *both*; if any one can trace theſe Things higher, I ſhould be glad to ſee it.

'Twas Pity that thoſe *Gentlemen*, who reformed the Abuſe of the *Lord's Supper*, did not conſider the Caſe of *Baptiſm* at the ſame Time, and reduce that alike to the *Standard* of the Goſpel. For ſince *both* Abuſes ſeem to have crept in, *Hand in Hand*, they ſhould by right have been *caſt out together*.

VI. I proceed to the ſixth Objection as given us by Mr. *W.* which is thus, *viz. the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm pretend that none are truely baptized, but thoſe who are dipp'd, and therefore Infant-Baptiſm perform'd by pouring or ſprinkling is not Chriſtian Baptiſm.* Certainly, he has a very odd Way of ſtating the Objections of other People, for all who know the Baptiſts, do know alſo that they object to both the Subject and the Mode. This is the *main* of the Controverſy between them and the Pædobaptiſts. They firmly hold that if Infants were *dipped*, ever ſo regularly, 'tis no *Chriſtian Baptiſm*; becauſe Chriſt never *appointed* any *ſuch Thing*; the Reaſon is plain enough. However Mr. *W.* has choſen in this Place to give us ſome ſhort Diſſertations on theſe three Points.

1. *Upon what Argument this Opinion of the neceſſity of Dipping is founded.*

2. *Why he looks upon Pouring or Sprinkling as lawful and valid as Dipping.*

" *her to us, as we were celebrating the Lord's-*
" *Supper. And the Girl being placed among the*
" *Saints, could not bear our Prayers and Suppli-*
" *cations, began now to ſhriek bitterly, and to be*
" *dreadfully toſſed and tormented in her Mind, and*
" *as if an Executioner was forcing a Confeſſion from*
" *her, ſhe in the ſimplicity of her Soul, acknow-*
" *ledged by all the Tokens ſhe could at that tender*
" *Age, the Conſciouſneſs of the Fact. The Conſe-*
" *cration of the Elements being over, the Deacon*
" *began to offer the Cup to thoſe who were preſent,*
" *and among others her Turn came; ſhe through*
" *a divine Inſtinct turn'd away her Face, ſhut her*
" *Mouth hard and faſt, refuſing the Cup. The*
" *Deacon perſiſted to give it her, and though ſhe*
" *reſiſted, yet he poured down by Force into her*
" *Throat, ſome of the Sacramental Wine. Imme-*
" *diately followed ſobbing and vomiting. The Eu-*
" *chariſt could not continue in a Body and Mouth*
" *ſo defiled with Idolatry. The Drink ſanctified*
" *in the Blood of our Lord, forced it's Way out of*
" *her polluted Bowels,* &c.

Here is the cleareſt Proof, that can be expected, that *Cyprian* gave the Lord's-Supper to Infants. So that if any Streſs can be laid upon his *giving Baptiſm* to them, the ſame Streſs may be laid upon his *giving the Euchariſt*; if his *Authority* be good in the *one*, 'tis good in the *other*. And if Mr. *W.* rejects the Practice of *Cyprian* in the Buſineſs of the *Lord's Supper*, why may not the *Baptiſts* reject his Practice of *baptizing Infants*, for the Scripture is equally a Stranger to *both theſe Things*. What I obſerve further is this, that

that theſe *Twin-Errors* ſeem to be equally *antient*; and *Cyprian* bids *faireſt*, to be the *firſt Father* who *openly* pleaded for *both*; if any one can trace theſe Things higher, I ſhould be glad to ſee it.

'Twas Pity that thoſe *Gentlemen*, who reformed the Abuſe of the *Lord's Supper*, did not conſider the Caſe of *Baptiſm* at the ſame Time, and reduce that alike to the *Standard* of the Goſpel. For ſince *both* Abuſes ſeem to have crept in, *Hand in Hand*, they ſhould by right have been *caſt out together*.

VI. I proceed to the ſixth Objection as given us by Mr. *W.* which is thus, *viz. the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm pretend that none are truely baptized, but thoſe who are dipp'd, and therefore Infant-Baptiſm perform'd by pouring or ſprinkling is not Chriſtian Baptiſm.* Certainly, he has a very odd Way of ſtating the Objections of other People, for all who know the Baptiſts, do know alſo that they object to both the Subject and the Mode. This is the *main* of the Controverſy between them and the Pædobaptiſts. They firmly hold that if Infants were *dipped*, ever ſo regularly, 'tis no *Chriſtian Baptiſm*; becauſe Chriſt never *appointed* any *ſuch Thing*; the Reaſon is plain enough. However Mr. *W.* has choſen in this Place to give us ſome ſhort Diſſertations on theſe three Points.

1. *Upon what Argument this Opinion of the neceſſity of Dipping is founded.*

2. *Why he looks upon Pouring or Sprinkling as lawful and valid as Dipping.*

3. *Why he prefers Pouring or Sprinkling to Dipping.*

Now, ſince our *Author*, has divided his Arguments into *theſe three General Heads*, it may not be improper for me to make ſome *general Remarks* upon them. As, 1. Since the *Greek* Word [Baptiſm] (βαπτισμα or βαπτισμὸς) does undoubtedly ſignify *Dipping*, if he cannot manifeſtly prove, that it alſo ſignifies *Waſhing* without *Dipping*, his Enquiry will amount to no more than this, whether *Dipping* be neceſſary to *Dipping*. Juſt as if a Man took the Pains to examine, whether *Eating* be neceſſary to the *Eating*, in the *Lord's-Supper*, 2. I obſerve, that he freely allows the *Lawfulneſs* and *Validity* of Dipping; if it was not of *divine Authority*, it could neither be *lawful* nor *valid*. This is doing uncommon *Juſtice* to the *Baptiſts*, to allow their Way to be *lawful* and *valid*, notwithſtanding the *little* and *mean* Things, that come afterwards in his Book, about the *Danger of their Practice in Dipping, all whom they baptize*. 3. He muſt prove *two Ways* at *leaſt*, of adminiſtring the Ordinance of Baptiſm. For he already grants that of *Dipping* to be *valid*; he muſt find out *another* Way, that the Scripture mentions and approves, otherwiſe 'tis *not lawful*. So that Mr. *W.* is not at his Liberty to *chooſe which Way* he will, for he muſt be determined by the *Scripture*. And if there be no *other Way* mentioned and preſcrib'd *there*, it follows by a clear and unavoidable Conſequence, that there is *no other Way*, *lawful* and *valid*.

But

But I must attend to what he says to these Things, in a more particular Manner.

1. He acquaints us. 45. *As to the Arguments upon which the Necessity of Dipping is founded, they are many and various. In Support of this Opinion we are commonly told, with a great deal of Assurance that the Words* βάπτω *and* βαπτίζω *always signify to dip or plunge. And we are told by Dr. Gale that the proper and primary Signification of the Words, is to dip or plunge. And that they never signify to sprinkle or pour, or any thing less than Dipping. The contrary of which will appear to those who are conversant in Greek Authors, who use these Words in a great Latitude, according to the well known Copiousness of the Greek Language.* To which I answer.

1. When Mr. *W.* talks of the *Assurance of the Baptists*, in urging that βάπτω and βαπτίζω do properly never signify any thing less than *Dipping*. He would do well to think of himself, when he tells us in the next Words, *the very contrary will appear to those who are conversant in Greek Authors*, since he has not thought fit to give us so much as *one Example* of this Nature. One who talks at this high Rate against the *poor Baptists*, and who is so conversant in *Greek Authors*, should have given us *clear Instances, where* βάπτω and βαπτίζω do signify *Pouring* or *Sprinkling*. 2. When we are told by him, that *these Words are used in a very great Latitude, according to the well known Copiousness of the Greek Language*. Does Mr. *W.* judge the *Copiousness* of a Language to consist in being *obliged* to make use

of *few Words* to ſignify a *great many Ideas?* Or does it not rather conſiſt in having a *Plenty* of Words to expreſs all *diſtinct* and *ſuitable Ideas?* And hence is the *Phraſe*, *Copia Verborum.* So that ſome *nice Readers* conclude, that he has loſt a *learned Remark* by this *Bargain.* Not but 'tis granted that the *Greek* Language is *Copious*, and has *plenty* of Words to ſignify the *different Sorts of Waſhings*; and βάπτω and βαπτίζω are two Words, that may ſerve to illuſtrate this, for they *both* ſignify to *waſh by dipping.* 3. He obſerves *that Dr.* Gale *took a great deal of Pains in quoting the* Greek *Authors who have made uſe of one or other of theſe Words, but Mr.* W's *intended Brevity will not admit him to examine many of theſe Quotations.* And does he think that this ſlight Way of paſſing it over, will give inquiſitive People, Satisfaction in a Point of this Importance? If he had not *Leiſure* to examine this Buſineſs to the *Bottom*, which is ſo very *material* in this *Controverſy*, he ſhould have left it to ſomebody elſe who had *Leiſure* and *Skill*, and all other *Qualifications equal to the Task:* Or have taken it *fairly* upon himſelf, to make it appear to the World, from *genuine* Greek *Authors*, that βάπτω and βαπτίζω do not *neceſſarily* imply *Dipping.* The *Baptiſts* have long waited for ſome *demonſtrative Performance* of this Kind, from a *capable Hand*, but in vain.

Now ſince Mr. *W.* has thought fit, only to ſingle out ſome few Inſtances, from Dr. *Gale*, I ſhall examine what he ſays to them.

1. He

1. He obſerves that *Dr*, Gale *produces* Homer, *as uſing the Word of a Smith hardening a Hatchet or Pole-ax, which he (βάπτει) dips in cold Water.* Mr. *W.* in Order to enervate this Inſtance, lets us know, *that a Smith by hardening an Edge-Tool, puts the Edge of the Tool a little Way into the Water, as far as the Steel goes, then takes it out to judge of the Temper by the Colour, after this the Smith takes a little Water into the Hollow of his Hand, and pours on ſome Places of the Edges, and drops it off his Fingers, and laſt of all puts it under Water.* To which I reply, can any thing be more weak and ridiculous than this *Method of arguing?* For Mr. *W. grants all* that *Dr.* Gale deſired; for 'tis *confeſſed* that the Smith, *puts the Tool at laſt under Water*; and this is what *Homer* and *Dr. Gale* call, βάπτει, or he *dips* the Tool in Water.

2. The next Inſtance he produces from Dr. *Gale*, is, of *one whoſe Face was ſmear'd over with tauny Colours, upon which Account it is ſaid to be* βαπτόμενος *baptized. Which is taken out of* Ariſtophanes, *who ſpeaking of the homely Entertainments of the Stage, before the Uſe of Masks; tells us how* Magnus *an old Comic of* Athens, *daub'd his Face,* which Mr. *W.* ſays *was not done by dipping his Face into theſe Colours, but by laying them on his Face, with his Finger, Spunge, or other Inſtrument.* To which I reply, that Dr. *Gale* fairly allowed all this; *that the Colour was laid on,* but that the *Man afterwards look'd,* as if βαπτόμενος, *dipp'd* into the Colour. Here is the *Strength* of the *Propriety* and *Signification* of the

Word *retain'd*, notwithſtanding the *Figure* of Speech. If Mr. *W.* will not allow of *Figures* in *Languages*, we ſhall make wretched Work with all *Authors*, and indeed with one another, in our *ordinary Diſcourſe*. Don't we commonly ſay, *ſuch a one* is *ſunk* (in the World) or he is *plunged* in *deſperate* Circumſtances. Was it not a *known Phraſe* in the *fatal Year*, 1720, to ſay *ſuch a Man* is *dipt* in the *South-Sea*, meaning that he was *deeply* engaged in that *pernicious Scheme*. Surely, an ordinary Capacity will readily apprehend the Meaning of ſuch a Way of ſpeaking, that 'tis not to be taken in a *litteral* Senſe.

3. The next Inſtance of Dr. *Gale*'s, taken Notice of, is that from *Strabo*, as uſing this Word of *Alexander*'s Soldiers, who marching a whole Day thro' the Waters (βαπτιζομένων) *dipt* up to the Waſt. And Mr. *W.* makes this Remark upon the Paſſage, *viz that the Word does not always ſignify a total Immerſion*. I ſhall only reply, that if they had been but *dipt* to the *Ankle*, 'twould have been *proper dipping* ſo far, for 'tis the *Signification* of the Word that we are enquiring after, the *Idea* in this Place, will anſwer for itſelf. For if you *dip* your *Hand*, your *Hand* is *truely dipt*, and if you *dip* but your *Finger*, your *Finger* is certainly and undeniably *dipt*. There are few People that love *cavilling* ſo well, as to ſtand long to diſpute ſuch a Thing.

4. The next Inſtance of Dr. *Gale*'s, is from *Plutarch*, of a *Roman General*, who a little before he died of his Wounds, ſet up a Trophy, on which, having *dipt* his Hand in *Blood*, he

wote

wrote an Inſcription. Mr. *W.* would invalidate this Paſſage, *by appealing to all who carefully conſider this Action, whether* βαπτσας *neceſſarily emplies dipping in this Place; and had not been better rendred waſhing or ſtaining, and whether the Nature of the Action does not lead us to believe, that this was perform'd by the Blood of his Wound running upon his Hands or Fingers.* To which I reply, that this would be downright abuſing the *Hiſtorian*, for he ſays, *that he dipt his Hand in the Blood, not that the Blood run upon his Hand*; if Mr. *W.* will take the Freedom to alter *Hiſtory*, he may alſo take the Liberty to change the *Meaning* of Words.

As to what follows, where he ſays, *that Dr.* Gale *owns, that it may be inferred from* Heb. 9. 19 *where we have an Account of* Moſes *ſprinkling the Book and the People after he had read the Law to them, that the Word* βαπτιζω *does not ſignify total Immerſion, or dipping the Thing ſpoken of all over*, &c. To which I reply, that the direct Deſign of Dr. *Gale* in citing *this Text*, Heb. 9. 19. was *to prove, that Water was mixt with the Blood of the Bird that was kill'd, wherein the living Bird was to be dipt*, according to *Levit.* 14. 51. And that it was not only very *poſſible*, but very *probable*, that the *living Bird* was properly *dipt* in the Blood of the *dead Bird*, when this Blood was *mixt*, with a Quantity of Water in a ſuitable Veſſel, according to the Commandment: therefore Dr. *Gale*, only brings *Heb.* 9. 19. to demonſtrate that *'twas uſual to mix Blood and Water together in their Purifications.* But Dr. *Gale* was well aware (tho'

Mr. *W.* does not ſeem to be ſo) that the Word βαπτίζω is not in the Text *Heb.* 9. 19. When *Moſes ---- took the Blood of Calves, and of Goats, with Water, and Scarlet Wool, and Hyſop, and* (ἐῤῥάντισε) *ſprinkled both the Book and all the People.* Therefore Dr. *Gale* argued *ſtrongly*, and clearly conſiſtent with his own *precedent Reaſoning*, tho' Mr. *W.* does not ſeem to have underſtood him.

The next Obſervation that we have upon Dr. *Gale*, is, *that he owns that the Man purified by the ſprinkling of the Water of Seperation on him, is by* Jeſus *the Son of* Syrach *called*, βαπτιζόμενος. Eccl. 34. 25. *But he lays the whole Streſs of his Purification upon the Man's bathing himſelf in Water.* To which I reply, that Dr. *Gale* does not lay the whole Streſs, of the Man's *Purification* on his *bathing* himſelf, but fairly confeſſes the *contrary*, that *ſprinkling* was *Part* of the Work, and the Scripture is plain that it *was ſo*, Numb. 19. 19. But then Dr. *Gale* juſtly obſerves, that *bathing* was *neceſſary*, and it ſeems to have been the *chief* and *finiſhing* Part of the *Ceremony*. Therefore Dr. *Gale* was certainly in the right of it, to lay the Streſs of the Man's being called βαπτιζόμενος, on his having *bathed* according to the *Commandment*. For this Reaſon what Mr. *W.* urges in the following Paragraph, *that the Purification of the Man conſiſted in ſprinkling*, is not only, of *no Weight* in this Matter, but is alſo *againſt plain Scripture*, for if the Party was *ſprinkled never ſo often*, yet 'tis evident from the Text juſt now cited, *Numb.* 19. 19. that the *Ceremony* was to be *compleated by Bathing*.

CHAP. VI.

The *Lexicographers*, and *Criticks* favour Dipping. *Some* Jewiſh Lotions *conſider'd, and Objections from thence anſwer'd. Divers Scriptures produc'd by the* Baptiſts *to prove the* Mode *of* primitive *Baptiſm, vindicated. Remarks on Mr.* W's *mean Way of arguing about our* Saviour's *Burial and the Reſemblance of* Dipping *to it.* Sprinkling *does not anſwer the Scripture-Deſcription, nor the true* Idea *of Baptiſm. A Teſtimony of the learned Sir* Norton Knatchbull *in favour of the* Baptiſts. Sprinkling *or* Pouring *occaſion'd Diſſatisfaction in* Cyprian's *Time.*

THE next Account that we have from Mr. *W.* is, *that if we conſult* Stephanus, Suidas, Scapula, Arias Montanus, *and* Leigh's Critica Sacra, *we ſhall find* βάπτω *and* βαπτίζω *to have theſe four Significations.*

1. Mergere & immergere *to plunge or drown.*
2. Tingere *to die or dip.*
3. Imbuere & madefacere *to moiſten or wet.*
4. Abluere & lavare *to waſh or cleanſe.*

To which I anſwer, 1. That all this makes for the *Baptiſts*, and againſt Mr. *W.* 'Tis plain that the *two firſt* Significations, are the *genuine* and *proper* Significations of the Words, mergere, immergere, tingere, *to plunge, or drown, to die or dip.* This is all we plead for. 2. The *two other* Significations

Significations are *conſequential* and are ſtrongly in our Favour; *imbuere*, and *madefacere*, *abluere* and *lavare*, *to moiſten or wet*, *to waſh or cleanſe*; and is it not common in *Wales*, to take a Slice of Bread, and to *moiſten* or *wet* it, by *dipping* it in a *Cup of good Ale?* Again is it not common to waſh *Blankets*, *Sheets* and *Shirts*, by *dipping* them in a *Veſſel* of Water? The *moiſtening*, *wetting*, *waſhing* and *cleanſing*, are *inſeperable Acts* from *dipping*, ſo that *the Words* βάπτω and βαπτίζω *neceſſarily imply* theſe Things. Hence 'tis evident, that theſe Teſtimonies, inſtead of *weakening* the Cauſe, I endeavour to defend, do it a *real Service.*

He farther obſerves in the ſame Page, *that 'tis unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that our Lord intended, that this Word which he made uſe of here, to expreſs the Modes of Baptiſm, ſhould be ſo limited to one particular Meaning, as that all other Modes of Baptiſm ſhould be eſteemed invalid.* To which I anſwer. How many *Modes of Baptiſm* has Mr. *W. found* in the Goſpel? Why ſhould he *think it unreaſonable*, that our *Lord* ſhould *make uſe of a Word*, which is ſuited to the *Nature* of the *Ordinance* to be perform'd? Was not our *Lord* a competent Judge, *what Word* would beſt expreſs *this Action?* Or does our *Author* want an *ambiguous* Word, or at *leaſt* to render *this Word* of our Lord *doubtful?* and *that on purpoſe* to introduce *Sprinkling*, or any other Method inſtead of *Dipping*, for *any other Way* will do well enough in his Account. But he ſhould conſider our *Lord* has given us, but one *Word* to ſignify *this Action*,

Action, and his holy Spirit accordingly aſſures us there is but one Baptiſm, *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.* For this Reaſon, we might well think, that People ſhould be more cautious, in their Enquiry into the *Mode* of *Adminiſtring* this Ordinance. Since there can be, but *one true Way* of it's Adminiſtration.

In the ſame Page, Mr. *W.* acquaints us, *that the Words* βαπτίζω *and* βαπτισμὸς, *are uſed of waſhing Hands, Cups, Tables and Beds*, Mark 7. *which he ſays were not all of them waſhed by dipping.* To which I anſwer, that he ſeems to be greatly miſtaken in this Place, for when the Text verſe 3. ſpeaks of waſhing of Hands, it does not make uſe of βαπτίζω but of another Word; ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας, and even *this Word* πυγμῇ joined to νίψωνται, *denotes*, that they waſhed their Hands very *carefully*, ſo far, as up to the *Wriſt* or *Elbow.* Tho' it will by *no Means* follow from hence, that νίψωνται and βαπτίσωνται are *equivalent* Terms.

2. When 'tis ſaid, that the Phariſees *waſhed themſelves upon their coming from the Market*, 'tis to be underſtood of their *bathing* themſelves, and therefore 'tis properly expreſſed by βαπτίσωνται, they *plunge or dip*, to waſh away the ſuppoſed uncleanneſs they had contracted in the *Market.* And 'twas *cuſtomary* with them upon every ſlight Occaſion *to do thus.* For *this Reaſon* they are upbraided with *fooliſh Superſtition.*

3. When βαπτισμὸς is applied to their waſhing of *Cups, Pots, Veſſels and Tables*, 'tis very eaſily accounted for. They ſuperſtitiouſly abuſed a Ceremony

Ceremony of *God's own Appointment.* Lev. 11. 32. For the Lord had commanded *that whether it be a Veſſel of Wood, or Raiment, or Skin, or Sack, whatſoever Veſſel it be, it muſt be put into Water.* But how theſe Things could be put into Water, without *dipping* of them, can't well be imagin'd. And if legal Pollutions required the waſhing of Garments, Skins, and Sacks, and Utenſils of all Sorts, except *earthen Veſſels, which were to be broken*, then, I ſay, 'tis no Wonder, that theſe fanciful People the *Jews*, abus'd the firſt Inſtitution of this Ceremony, by ridiculouſly waſhing almoſt every thing, and their *Beds*, amongſt other *Implements.*

Mr. *W.* proceeds, to conſider thoſe Scriptures that are produced by the *Baptiſts*, to prove that Baptiſm is to be performed by *dipping only.* p. 49. 50. and the firſt Inſtance he gives, in *John* 3. 23. John *baptized in* Ænon *near to* Salim *becauſe there was much Water there.* 1. He denies the Conſequence, *that the Reaſon why* John *baptized in* Ænon *was becauſe there was much Water there*, and alledges that the Reaſon why *John* choſe this Place, was, *that thoſe who came to his Baptiſm might not travel far for the Ordinance.* To which I anſwer, that this Method of arguing is not only ſubverſive of the natural Meaning of the Scripture in this Place, but is alſo *ſelf-contradictory.* For the Inhabitants of thoſe *Neighbourhoods* and of the *adjacent* Country were to come to *Ænon*, for the ſake of a *Sufficiency* of Water to *dip* them in. For this Reaſon they were to *travel* to the Place that the Adminiſtrator

Adminiſtrator had choſen *for a Time, merely* on Account of the convenient *Depth* of Water that was *found there.* Mr. *W.* is *againſt their travelling*, the Scripture gives the *Reaſon of their travelling*, I would ask the Reader, which of the *two* beſt deſerves our Attention and Belief? Beſides, * *Ænon* was a *ſmall Town or Village* not far from *Jordan*, and we are clearly inform'd that the People did *once* travel from *Jeruſalem* and all Parts of *Judea*, even to the *very* River *Jordan*, to be *decently* baptized there, of *John.* And pray what is the *Reaſon* that People might not *as well* travel to this *Ænon*, as others had *once* done to *Jordan*, to have a *Sufficiency* of Water for the eaſy Adminiſtration of *Baptiſm?*

2. Mr. *W.* urges, *that Water was very ſcarce, in theſe hot Countries.* I would ask him, was Water ſcarce in the Land of *Canaan*, to whom ſhall we give Credit in this Caſe again? to him and ſome few *prejudiced Pædobaptiſts*, or to the bleſſed God? Who gave this *Character* of the *Land* in general, both as to the *Hills* and the *Valleys*, Deut. 8. 7. *For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good Land, a Land of Brooks of Waters, of Fountains, and Depths that ſpring out of Valleys and Hills.* So that in thoſe Places where they had not *Brooks* running upon the *Surface* of the *Earth*, they had *Wells* and *Springs* in the *Earth*, which ſupplied their Families with *neceſſary* Water. And every conſiderate Man knows, that one *Pail*, *Pitcher*, or *Bucket*

* Locus Palæſtinæ ad Jordanem *Flu. Car. Steph.* Dict. Hiſt. Geo. *&c.*

full

full of Water, would have been as good for *ſprinkling*, (had that been the *Cuſtom*) as a *large River*. Therefore if this had been *John's* Practice, he would have no Need, to come to *Ænon* becauſe there was *much Water*; but the Reaſon that the Scripture offers, ſpeaks aloud, that a *ſmall Quantity* would not do, therefore the People to be *baptized*, *muſt go to* John, where there was *much Water*. As for Mr. *W*'s *Criticiſm*, that the Original, ὕδατα πολλά, had been better tranſlated *many Waters*, he might have ſpared it, for it neither does him Credit nor Service; and he may eaſily ſee, that when * πολὺ is applied to ὕδωρ, or when πολλὰ is applied to ὕδατα, whether the Phraſe be in the *ſingular* or *plural* Number, it denotes a great *Quantity of Water*, both in the *holy Scriptures*, and in other *Authors*. And with all, *one ſingle* Rivulet having Pools, of *fair* and *deep* Water, would have been as fit for *John*'s Purpoſe, as if he had *twenty*, wherein to adminiſter the *Ordinance of Baptiſm*. For he and his deputed Diſciples might in their Turns, relieve one another, and conſequently baptize many hundreds in a little Time. And again, if we take *many* Waters to *ſprinkle* with, would not *one Spring*, or *Fountain*, or *Well*, afford Water *enough* to ſprinkle *many thouſands*. Therefore take this *officious* Tranſlation of *many Waters*, inſtead of *much Water*, in what Light you will, it appears *frivolous*; and indeed only ſerves, to ſhew the *Weakneſs* of that Cauſe, that wants ſuch *trifling* and groundleſs Remarks.

* See the laſt Chapter of this Book.

2. The

2. The ſecond Scripture that Mr. *W.* brings, is *Matt* 3. 16. where Chriſt is ſaid *to go up ſtraightway out of the Water.* And where our Author asks this Queſtion, *what if we ſay that* ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος *had been more properly rendred from the Water?* by the Help of which Tranſlation he would perſwade us, that our Lord was not in *Jordan*, only upon the *Brink* or *Bank* of it. I anſwer, 'tis a wretched Shift, that he and others are put to. Let him compare this Account with that in *Mark* 1. 9. *And* Jeſus *was baptized of* John *in* Jordan, the *Greek* is εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην *he was dipp'd into* Jordan, let him ſtretch all the Wit and Thought he has, and try whether the *Bank*, or *riſing Ground*, was the objective Matter into which the Body of our Lord was baptized. Was he baptized into the *Water*, or into the *ſolid Earth*? Again, where does the Scripture declare *John* and the Perſons he baptized, to be? Upon dry Ground or in the Water? for Satisfaction in this Caſe we are told expreſly, *he baptized them in the River* Jordan, and not upon the *Banks* of that River. Mark 1. 5. --- *and were all baptized of him in the River* Jordan (ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ) I hope that every Body underſtands the Difference, between a River and a riſing Ground. And now, why will Mr. *W.* make uſe of fallacious Doubling, and Winding, to impoſe upon the ſimple and unwary Reader, to make him believe, that our Lord was not in the Water of *Jordan*, when the Scripture ſays plainly; that he was *baptized in it, and into it?*

But

But Mr. *W.* does not think himſelf ſafe as yet, he ſeems to carry a Conſciouſneſs along with him, that *John* did really baptize by dipping; for he ſays p. 51. *that* John's *Baptiſm is not to be the Chriſtian Pattern, as to the Mode of it.* I would ask him, who alter'd the Mode? Our Lord did not, nor his Apoſtles after him, nor did they that ſucceeded them alter it 'till above 200 Years after our *Saviour's Time.* With what Face then would Mr. *W.* ſuggeſt, that *our Lord in the Words of the Commiſſion gave Authority to alter the Mode of Baptiſm?* Is there any ſuch Thing hinted there, as a *Change* of the *Mode* of adminiſtring this Ordinance? No, far from it, for our Lord confirm'd the Mode of Baptiſm in the Way and Manner, that *John* had practiced it from the Beginning, adding a ſettled Form of Words, in the Adminiſtration of it, to the End of the World.

But I proceed to the third Scripture that Mr. *W.* produces, as *that* which the Baptiſts urge in Proof of Dipping, which is *Acts* 8. 36. ---- 39. Wherein the Account of the *Eunuch*'s Baptiſm, we read Verſe 38. *that they went both down into the Water*, and Verſe 39. *they came both up out of the Water* ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος. In Anſwer to which Mr. *W.* ſays, *here is not one Word of Dipping.* No! What is it not ſaid Verſe 38. that Philip *baptized the Eunuch in that Water?* And did not our Author juſt now confeſs that the Word βαπτίζω *ſignifies to dip?* Did he not bring Criticks and Lexicographers to vouch the Signification of the Word βαπτίζω, as well as βάπτω, to denote, *merge-*

re

re & immergere, tingere, to plunge or drown, to dye or dip? 'tis ſtrange if there ſhould not be a Word here of *Dipping*, when by the Confeſſion of himſelf and others, the chief and primary Signification of the Word is to *dip*. Nor is Mr. *W.* nor any Body elſe able to ſhew, one Inſtance, out of any Author, where the Word is ever uſed to ſignify *pouring* or *ſprinkling*. Since the *native* and *proper* Meaning of it, always imports *Dipping*.

But becauſe his Reaſoning in the Paragraph following, is ſomewhat remarkable, I ſhall briefly take Notice of it. He ſays, they *(the Baptiſts) will ask perhaps what* Philip *and the* Eunuch *did in the Water*. Mr. *W.* anſwers, *baptize the Eunuch, but whether by dipping or ſprinkling, remains yet a Queſtion notwithſtanding this Text*. To which I reply, that the Queſtion remains only with *prejudiced Minds*, who are willing to baffle Scripture-Evidence, for moſt of the beſt *Annotators* and *Expoſitors* that he can conſult, agree that the Eunuch was *dipp'd*. But we are told, *that Perſons who wore Sandals, might with a little Trouble, go a little Way into the Water, and when there,* Philip *might take up ſome of the Water in his Hand and pour it upon the Eunuch*. To which I reply, that *pouring* or *ſprinkling*, or taking Water up in the *Hands*, to adminiſter this *Ordinance* with, did not come in *Faſhion* for a great many Years after *Philip's Time*, you muſt wait 'till *Father Cyprian*'s Days, before you hear, of any *Plea* in Favour of *ſprinkling*. The *primitive* Chriſtians made uſe of

Rivers, Brooks or Lakes, or had their *Baptiſteries* and proper Places and Conveniences to dip in, by Way of clear Conformity to Scripture-Precedents of baptizing or dipping in *Jordan*, in *Ænon*, and in this *Water*, where the *Eunuch* was baptized. I may add further, that if taking Water up in the Hand would have done, then neither *Philip* nor the *Eunuch* had any Occaſion to go into the Water *at all*; but only to go to the *Water-ſide*, and *Philip*, by taking ſome up in the Hollow of his Hand, *might do the Buſineſs*. Nor indeed was there any Occaſion for the *Eunuch* to come out of his *Chariot*, for he might as well have been *ſprinkled* there, *ſitting*, as the *Clinicks* and ſick Perſons were baptized in their *Beds in Cyprian's* Time. The *Eunuch-Treaſurer* might eaſily have order'd one of his *Attendants* to fetch ſome Water to the *Chariot-Door*. Tho' indeed Reaſon ſeems ſufficiently to intimate to us, that a Perſon of his *Quality*, did not undertake ſuch a Journey, without *Veſſels of Wine and Water*, to refreſh himſelf and Retinue, in travelling thro' *ſandy* and *deſert* Countries, to get Home to *Ethiopia*; and ſo a *little* Water out of his own Bottle, would have done as well for *ſprinkling*, as that which they *met with by the Way*. But, *they both went down into the Water*, *both* Philip *and the* Eunuch, that this eminent *Convert* might be baptized or *dipp'd* therein, according to the Inſtitution of our *Lord*. What follows from Mr. *W.* is ſo mean and ſilly, that I am very ſenſible the Repetition of it will be fulſome to the Reader, *viz. if the* Eunuch *was dipp'd, it is plain*

that

that his whole Body was not dipp'd by Philip. *For according to their Argument and Practice, he went into the Water, and ſo dipp'd Part of his Body himſelf, and if* Philip *plung'd him, 'twas only that Part of his Body that he had not plung'd himſelf.* Any one may eaſily obſerve, that our Author does not know what to do with this Inſtance, he would ſuppreſs it, if he could, and ſmother the Evidence of Truth, that appears ſo glaring in it. He ſeems to confeſs by halves, that *Philip* dipp'd Part of the *Eunuch*, but 'tis with Regret, that this partial Confeſſion comes thus dribbling from him. And therefore, I proceed to what Mr. *W.* advances p. 52. where he tells us, *that the Scriptures which the Author of the Reflections (Dr.* Gale*) upon Mr.* Wall, *and others lay great Streſs upon, and often quote in Proof of Dipping, as* Rom. 6, 4. *and* Coll. 2. 12. *where Chriſtians are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm*, but he tells us, *that it falls out unhappily, that neither of theſe Texts relate to the Mode of Baptiſm. So that tho' they ſhould produce ten thouſand Quotations out of ſuch as underſtood them in this Senſe, it will be nothing to the Purpoſe.* To which I anſwer, I imagin'd that Mr. *W.* paid greater Veneration, to thoſe very able and learned Pædobaptiſt-Expoſitors, who give their Sentiments againſt him, and who explain theſe Places as referring to the antient, and Scripture Mode of baptizing; nor is it poſſible, to give a rational and fair Account of theſe Expreſſions, without giving this Interpretation of them, *i. e. that they ſhew the Reſemblance* there

is, between our *Baptiſm* and the *Death of Chriſt*, as well as our *Death to Sin*; and between his *Reſurrection*, and our *riſing again* to a *Life of Righteouſneſs*. *We are buried with him by Baptiſm into Death, and planted together in the Likeneſs of his Death.* ---- *alſo in the Likeneſs of his Reſurrection.* Now if Mr. *W.* thinks fit, to deny the Truth of this Expoſition *ten thouſand Times*, I promiſe not to believe him, ſo that I am juſt even with him, for his *Poſitiveneſs* in this Matter. What we have in the next Paragraph is the ſame Sort of *ridiculous Logic*, with that which I have but juſt now tranſcribed p. 52. where he ſays, *that there is no good Reſemblance betwixt Chriſt's Burial and Dipping in Baptiſm, his Reſurrection and their coming out of the Water, or from under the Water; it will be own'd that Chriſt was carried to the Tomb, ſuch as are dipp'd go themſelves into the Water. Chriſt in the Language of Scripture lay three Days and three Nights in the Tomb; they never continue three Minutes under Water. Chriſt's Burial was not by plunging into the Earth, but laying him in a Tomb cut of a Rock, which for ought they know, was without ſo much as covering him with Earth, they are plung'd into the Water,*

Now, tho' this looſe and romantic Way of talking, does ſufficiently expoſe itſelf, and needs no Remarks, yet for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I ſhall obſerve theſe following Things. 1. Mr. *W.* knows that Similitudes were never deſign'd to run *exactly parallel*, there is a *Parity* and *Diſparity* always allowed in *Metaphors*.

2. When

2. When he talks of *continuing three Minutes under Water*, I never heard of any who were continued half *one Minute* there; for 'tis not the *Length* of *Duration*, but the *Nature* of the *Action*, and its Conformity to the Command of *Chriſt*, that muſt render the *Ordinance valid*, 3. When he ſays, *that Chriſt's Burial was not by plunging him into the Earth, but laying him in a Tomb cut out of a Rock, which for ought they know, was without ſo much as covering him with Earth.* I anſwer, that our *Lord* was *buried* after the Manner of the *Jews*, and of the *beſt Families* among them; *Joſeph of Arimathea* in whoſe *Tomb* he was laid, was a *Perſon of Honour*, and a *Member* of their *Sanhedrim*, and we find that *Abraham* purchaſed the Cave of *Magpela* for an *hereditary* Place of *Burying* after this Manner. *Gen.* 23. 20. It may not be improper to inſert here, what the learned *Caſaubon* has given us, in a *Diſſertation* on the *Jewiſh* Way of burying in theſe *Caves* or *Tombs*. Where he informs us, that after the *Cave* was *dug* or *made*, there were *ſeveral Pits* or *Holes* in the Form of *Graves*, made at the *Bottom*, to place ſo many *Corpſes* in. And according to this Account, every *Corps* muſt be *doubly* buried, *firſt* in the *Cave*, *afterwards* in its *proper Hole*. His Words are theſe.

* *But in the Cave there were eight, or as others will have it thirteen Holes made, to place diffe-*

* In eâ autem Caverna octo (alii volunt tredecim) cavanda erant foramina, ad ſingula Corpora reponenda.——

totum

rent Corpſes in,---- the Ground was all ſtony round about Jeruſalem, *the Place where the Body of our Lord was laid, was one of thoſe eight or thirteen Holes, ---- and in the next Section, he tells us, that theſe Pits or Holes, were dug ſeven Cubits deep,* &c.

And now, pray, is there no good *Reſemblance* and *Analogy* between *our Baptiſm*, and the *Burial* of our *Lord?* He was *decently* laid in the *Tomb* or *Cave*, in the *Heart* of the *Earth*, and they who are *baptized*, are *decently* laid in the *Heart* of the *Water*. He was *rais'd again to* a never dying Life, they who are *baptized*, are *raiſed again* to a *Profeſſion of Newneſs of Life*, and into the *Belief of Chriſt's Reſurrection*. So that Mr. *W*. may oppoſe and deny this *Reſemblance* as long as he thinks proper, but he will thereby only manifeſt his own impotent Prejudice, he will never be able to deſtroy the *Significancy* of *Dipping*, in the Ordinance of *Baptiſm*, ſince the Scripture ſo plainly declares the *Likeneſs* there is between it, and the *Burial* of Jeſus Chriſt. 2. It may be worth while to conſider that Dr. *Hammond*, who ſeems to be a *Favourite-Author* with Mr. *W*. does not ſcruple to aſſert the *Reſemblance* between *Primitive-Baptiſm*, and the *Burial* of our Lord. The Doctor's Words on *Rom.* 6. 3. are theſe, *'tis a*

totum circa Jeruſalem ſolum eſſe ſaxoſum. Locus ubi poſitum eſt Corpus Domini, unum erat ex illis octo vel tredecim foraminibus —— foramina in quibus Corpora condebantur, ad ſeptem cubitorum altitudinem ſolere cavari, &c. *Caſauboni Excercit. ad Card. Baron. p.* 470, 471.

Thing

Thing that every Chriſtian knows, that the Immerſion in Baptiſm, refers to the Death of Chriſt, the putting of the Perſon baptized into the Water, denotes and proclaims, the Death and Burial of Chriſt. and certainly, there can't be a conciſer and fairer Account, of the meaning of the Place.

3. When Mr. *W.* would ſuggeſt, that the Body of our Lord was not ſo much as *covered with Earth* when he was *buried*, I would aſk him, if a *Corps* was depoſited after this Manner in a *Cave*, *dug* in the *Side* of one of the *Hills*, or Rocks, not far from *Abergavenny*, whether the *ſaid Corps*, would not be judg'd to be *ſufficiently* and *properly* interr'd?

I come now to Mr. *W*'s Reaſons, why he looks upon Baptiſm by *ſprinkling* or *pouring*, as *valid* as that perform'd by *dipping*, p. 53. where he tells us, *I think the Command to baptize requires no more, but that it ſhould be done by Application of Water, without determining how the Water is to be applied.* To which I anſwer, 1. That 'tis a manifeſt *Reflection* upon the *Wiſdom* of our *Lord*, as well as an *Inſult* upon common *Senſe*, to attempt to perſuade People, that *all Nations* are left to their *Liberty*, how they *adminiſter* a Goſpel-Ordinance; and that there was, *no ſettled way*, of adminiſtring this Inſtitution at *firſt*, but that it was *careleſly* left to the various Humours and Fancies of *whimſical* Men. One may eaſily perceive the Reaſon of Mr. *W*'s *Indifferency* in this Point, 'tis *that he may be at Liberty to ſprinkle*; but if he could find *Sprink-*

ling, *once* us'd in Scripture, he would ſoon condemn all *other ways*, and plead for *that only*: but becauſe he *ſees* and *confeſſes*, that *Dipping* was uſed in the *Primitive* Times, *therefore* he is for any other way to avoid *that*, for it does not pleaſe him *at all*; this is the *viſible* State of his Caſe.

2. Who gave him and others Authority to *diverſify* the *Mode* of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm? is he to act as his Fancy leads him, in *licenciouſly* altering an Inſtitution of *Chriſt?*

3. I would fain know, whether he would be ſatisfied, if *ſome* of his Brethren ſhould take upon them, to *ſprinkle* the *Feet* inſtead of the *Face*, or to *ſprinkle* the *Hands* inſtead of *all the reſt*; would this be *valid?* would it anſwer a *good Conſcience towards God*, in obeying him in this Ordinance? did *our Lord* leave it at ſo *looſe* and indifferent a *Rate*, as that People may *with Safety* take ſuch a *Liberty?*

4. When Mr. *W.* talks of the *Application of Water* in Baptiſm, the *Phraſe* ſuits well enough to the *Practice* of *Sprinkling*, but does by *no means* agree with the *Idea* the Scripture gives us of the *Adminiſtration* of Baptiſm: for in a *ſtrict logical* Senſe, in the Caſe of Baptiſm, the *Water* is not ſo much applied to the *Body*, as the *Body* is applied to the *Water*: thus *John* baptized in the Waters of *Jordan* and *Ænon* by putting the *Bodies* of *Men* and *Women* into *thoſe Waters*. And *Philip* and the *Eunuch*, went both *into* the Water, 'tis not ſaid, that it was *brought to them*, nor is it ſaid to be *applied* to the

the *Eunuch*, but his *Body* was baptized or *dipp'd* in *it*: ſo that according to the *true Idea* of Adminiſtration, and the *proper way* of ſpeaking of it, the *Body* is the *Subject*, which is *applied* to the Water, as the *Object*, *into* which 'tis *baptized*. And indeed the Method of *Sprinkling of Infants*, deſtroys the *very Scripture-Notion* of true Baptiſm; both the *Subject* and the *Mode* are *incompatible* with the Deſcription of the Goſpel; and any unbiaſſed Judge (a *Turk*, *Jew*, or an *Indian*) in reading the *New* Teſtament, would wonder, how it ſhould enter into the *Heads* of People, to ſubſtitute *Sprinkling*, in the Room of *Dipping*, which the Scripture conſtantly refers to, and to *content themſelves* with *Babes*, inſtead of *penitent Men* and *Women*, who, *by Right* ought to make an *open* Confeſſion of Sin, to *God* and his *Church*, before they are admitted to this *holy Ordinance*. The *Innovation* is *ſurprizing*, to *any*, except *thoſe*, who are *educated* in Favour of it.

Therefore, what he ſays in the Paragraph following, is to little Purpoſe, *viz. that a little Water is as ſignificant of the Blood of Chriſt, and the Graces of the Spirit, as a great deal.* For reducing the *Quantity* of Water, from a ſufficiency to *dip*, only to a ſufficiency to *ſprinkle*, *deſtroys* the *very Being* of Goſpel-Baptiſm. For, as a *ſmall* Quantity of *Wine*, only to *wet* the *Lips*, or *Tip* of the *Tongue*, in the Lord's Supper, cannot be called *Drinking*, and conſequently can't anſwer the *End* in that Ordinance; ſo a *little Water* only ſufficient to *ſprinkle*, can't be

ſaid

ſaid to be *Goſpel-Baptiſm*, for the *Nature* of the Ordinance requires *dipping*: the *formal Cauſe* here enters into the *very Nature* of the *Thing* it ſelf. It may not be improper in this Place, to lay before the Reader, ſome Obſervations of the Learned Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, in his *Annotations* on that Paſſage of the *Apoſtle Peter*, 1 Pet. 3, 20, 21. —— *wherein few, that is, eight Souls, were ſaved by Water: the like Figure whereunto, even Baptiſm, doth alſo now ſave us (not the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh, but the Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God) by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.* After having elaborately explain'd the Words, he ſays, 'ſo 'that in Concluſion we may poſitively affirm, 'that *Baptiſm is properly and ſolely a Type of 'the Reſurrection*: and to this Truth do give 'their Suffrage *the Apoſtles, Fathers, Schoolmen, 'almoſt all Interpreters ancient and modern,* 'and even our *Engliſh Church* it ſelf, its Judg- 'ment being manifeſt in the *Rubrick* of the '*Common Prayer*, which enjoins the *dipping* of 'Infants in *Baptiſm*, allowing only in ſome Ca- 'ſes the Liberty of *Sprinkling* or *Perfuſion.* The 'Thing it ſelf is ſo manifeſt, that there is no 'Need of Teſtimonies to confirm it; but be- 'cauſe there be not a few which teach other- 'wiſe, led thereunto by Example and vulgar 'Error, it will not be amiſs, if but to free my 'ſelf from the Imputation of too much Confi- 'dence, out of innumerable Teſtimonies, to 'cite ſome few. And we firſt begin from the 'Apoſtle Paul, Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν, &c.

&c. *know you not that ſo many as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his Death? therefore we are buried with him by Baptiſm into Death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in Newneſs of Life,* Rom. 6. 3, 4. &c. Συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, &c. *being buried with him in Baptiſm, wherein you are alſo riſen with him, through Faith of the Operation of God, who has raiſed him from the Dead.* Col. 2. 12. Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν &c. *elſe what ſhall they do, who are baptized for Dead* (Bodies) *if the Dead riſe not.* 1 Cor. 15. 29. As much as if he had ſaid, in vain does the Church uſe the Sign of *Baptiſm*, if there be no Reſurrection. You have it abundantly proved alſo in the primitive and latter Writers. For Example, that believing on his Death, διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ κοινωνοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ γένησθε *by his Baptiſm ye may be made Partakers of his Reſurrection.* Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. βάπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, *Baptiſm was given to ſet forth the Death of the Lord.* Ep. ad Philadel. in the Name of *Ignatius. The Death of Chriſt,* Conſt. Apoſt. τοῦ πάθους καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι πληροῦμεν τὰ σύμβολα, *in Baptiſm we perform the Signs of his Paſſion and Reſurrection.* Juſt. Mart. *we know one ſaving Baptiſm, ſince there is but one Death for the World, and one Reſurrection,* ὧν τύπος ἐστὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, *whereof Baptiſm is the Type,* &c. Baſil Mag. *hear what* St. Paul ſaith

ſaith, *they were all baptized in the Cloud, and*
in the Sea, βάπτισμα καλεῖ τὴν θαλάττης ὁδὸν
he calleth their Paſſage through the Sea, *Bap-*
tiſm; for it was an Eſcape from Death, &c.
Baſil. Seleuc. ὅταν μέλλωμεν βαπτίζειν, *when we*
go about to baptize, we bid to ſay, I believe in
the Reſurrection of the Dead, and in this Faith
we are baptized. Chryſoſt. Baptiſms Re-
ſurrectionis pignus & imago, *Baptiſm is*
Pledge and Figure of the Reſurrection, Ambr.
Baptiſmus Arrabo Reſurrectionis, *Baptiſm*
an Earneſt of the Reſurrection; Lanct. Aqua-
rum Elemento ſepelimur, *we are buried in the*
Element of Water, Anſelm. Merſio Mortis
& ſepulturæ formam gerit, *Immerſion bears*
the Form of Death and Burial, Bernard. Lau-
dabilius, & tutius, & communius, *&c. Bap-*
tiſm is perform'd more laudably, more ſafely,
and more commonly by Dipping, for by Dipping,
the Figure of Chriſt's Burial is repreſented, T.
Aquin. Ipſum baptizandi verbum mergere
ſignificat, *&c. The Word Baptiſm does ſignify*
Dipping under the Water, and it is evident the
ancient Church uſed the Ceremony of Dipping,
Calv. Baptiſmus Græca vox eſt, &c. *Baptiſm*
is a Greek Word, and ſignifies properly Immer-
ſion in the Water, and this Signification does
agree with our Baptiſm, and hath Analogy to
the Thing ſignified, for by Baptiſm we are bu-
ried together, and as it were drowned with
Chriſt, being dead to Sin, &c. Zanch. ——
I ſhall only add the Judgment of an ingenious
and learned Man, whoſe Teſtimony in this

Matter

Matter is not to be ſuſpected or refuted. His Words are theſe, " Porro quamvis immerſionis Ceremonia, & olim fuit Communior, *&c.* Tho' the Ceremony of Immerſion was anciently more common, as appears by the unanimous Diſcourſe of the Fathers when they ſpeak of this Matter, and doth more lively repreſent the Death, Burial and Reſurrection of the Lord and us, which are myſtically done in Baptiſm; the which Signification of Immerſion the Fathers do ſo often urge, *&c.* from whence St. *Thomas* affirms, that the Ceremony or Rite of *Dipping* is the moſt commendable. Yet there have been many Reaſons, for which it was ſometimes convenient to change this *Cuſtom* of *Dipping* into ſome *other* Kind of *Ceremony near* unto it, *&c.* From hence therefore the Ceremony of Perfuſion, or *pouring* on of Water, as *middle* between *Sprinkling* and *Dipping*, was much in Uſe; which Cuſtom *Bonaventure* ſaith, was in his Time much obſerved in the *French Churches* and ſome others, tho' he confeſſes the Ceremony of *Dipping* was, the more common, the more fit, and the more ſecure, as St. *Thomas* teacheth, *&c.*——Thus far *Eſtius*, in whoſe Words, we have a manifeſt and ingenious Conceſſion, that *Dipping* was the *ancient* Ceremony, which *conſtantly* the *Fathers taught*, as more *lively repreſenting* the *Death*, *Burial*, and *Reſurrection of Chriſt and us*; that the *Schoolmen* held the ſame, for the moſt ſecure and commendable *Cuſtom*:

That

'That the Cuſtom of Perfuſion crept *unawares* 'into the *Church*, for *what Cauſes* he mentions 'not.' —— and a little *further*, 'to put an 'End to this Diſcourſe (ſays this *Learned Knight*) 'I do *affirm* with *Alexander de Halys*, *Tinctio 'eſt formalis Cauſa Baptiſmi*; that *Dipping* is 'the *formal Cauſe* of Baptiſm, *&c.*" Now 'tis a very light Matter with the *Baptiſts*, what Regard Mr. *W.* or ſome of his *Brethren*, may pay to theſe *Teſtimonies*, *Suffrages* and *Conceſſions*; 'tis ſufficient to obſerve, that ſuch a *Cloud of Witneſſes*, *Apoſtles*, *Fathers*, *Schoolmen* and *Reformers*, are *infinitely above* his Contempt, and they all *jointly reflect*, *a ſingular Honour on the Practice of the Baptiſt-Churches*; which have the *Courage* to *aſſert* and to *practice* this Truth, in *an Age*, that *ſhamefully* runs with the *Stream of Popularity*, in the neglect of a *due* Submiſſion, to a *ſolemn* Ordinance of *Jeſus Chriſt*.

But what Mr. *W.* ſays *p.* 54 is remarkable, that He can't think, *that all who were baptized in the Apoſtolic Age were dipp'd*, &c. I anſwer, his Incredulity is of no Weight, in this Controverſy, 'tis ſufficient that he confeſſes they *dipp'd* in the *Apoſtolic Age*. But 'tis material for him to acquaint us, whether they uſed *two ways*, or any *other way* than *Dipping*, in that Age, and let him ſhew us where he has found it, and what that *particular* other way was. This is what the Baptiſts require a Proof of, if he or any others can produce it.

As to what he ſays p. 55. *That St*, Cyprian *in a ſet Diſcourſe on this Subject*, *declares Baptiſm*

tism by Sprinkling, as valid as that by Immersion. I answer, that this is not a fair Representation of *Cyprian*'s Case. For

1. *Cyprian* does not represent *Sprinkling* as the *ordinary* and *stated* way of Baptizing, but as a *Thing* that might in his Opinion be excused in Cases and Instances of *mere* Necessity. Therefore this Method of *Sprinkling* was only used to Persons, who were *Sick*, *Weak*, and *Bedrid*, who were in eminent Danger of Death, and who could not come out of their *Beds*, to be baptized in the usual way of *Dipping*: For this Reason they were called, *Clinicks*.

2. *Cyprian* does not so much as pretend that *Sprinkling* was ever made Use of by the *Apostles*, therefore he does not offer to urge their Authority in Defence of it, but humbly and modestly propounds his own Opinion in this Matter, nor was he over eager, to impose his Sentiments upon others, but leaves them to their Liberty to judge, and act in the Case as they thought fit and most reasonable. The Ground that he argues from, is, the sprinkling of Waters under the *Ceremonial Law*, on some Occasions, and some *metaphorical Sprinkling* mention'd by the *Prophet Ezekiah*, *Num.* 19. 4. and 19. 19. *Ezek.* 36. 25. Surely this is too slight and far fetch'd a way of Reasoning, to determine the Mind of any considerate Man, about an Ordinance of the *New Testament*.

3. This *Novel* way of *Sprinkling* that *Cyprian* was willing to recommend in some *necessitous Cases*, it seems, gave Scandal and Offence to other

other Chriſtians, as appears by divers Inſtances from himſelf: The *very Epiſtle* that he wrote to *Magnus*, ſufficiently ſhews the Diſſatisfaction and Scruple that *Magnus* had in his own Mind about this Buſineſs. For the *Queſtion* was, whether ſuch were to be accounted *lawful Chriſtians*, who had been only *ſprinkled* in their *Beds*, and not baptized by *Dipping* according to the *ſtated Method of the Church*. Now *Cyprian* to ſoften the Matter, declares that he was not for preſcribing to any Body. And indeed the Epiſtle to *Magnus* is full of Difficulties and Objections thrown in his way, on the Account of this *newly invented* Practice of *Sprinkling* the *Clinicks*, which he endeavours modeſtly to remove, and to anſwer. He begins in ſtating of the Queſtion *thus*. * " *You ask me* " *dear Son, what I think of thoſe, who have ob-* " *tain'd the Grace of God in their Weakneſs and* " *languiſhing State, whether they are to be ac-* " *counted true Chriſtians, ſince they have been only* " *perfus'd (or ſprinkled) and not waſhed all over,* " *in the Saving Laver.*

He anſwers him in this Manner, " † *my Mo-* " *deſty will not allow me to prepoſſeſs the Minds of others*

---

* Quæſiſti etiam Fili chariſſime, quid mihi de illis videatur, qui in infirmitate & languore, Gratiam Dei conſequantur, an habendi ſint legitimi Chriſtiani, eò quod, aqua ſalutari, non loti ſint, ſed perfuſi? *Cyp. Ep.* ad *Mag. Edit. Paris.* 1643.

† Qua in parte Nemini Verecundia & Modeſtia noſtra præjudicat, quo minus unuſquiſque quod putat, ſentiat, &

" *others with my Sentiments, let every one rather* " *think and judge as he pleaſes, and act accord-* " *ingly,* ——— and a little further he ſays, *that* " *in the Saving Sacraments, when Neceſſity obli-* " *ges, and God granting his Indulgence, Abridge-* " *ments of divine Things, will confer all that is* " *neceſſary on true Believers.*

As he proceeds, he is obliged to anſwer divers Objections, made by thoſe, who were againſt this Sprinkling, where he ſays, " * It " ought not to make any Body uneaſy, in that " the Sick are ſprinkled, or have Water poured " upon them, ——— moreover there are ſome, " who will not give the Name of Chriſtians, " but *Clinicks*, to ſuch as have obtained the " Grace of Chriſt, by the Saving Water (of " Sprinkling) and true Faith, I cannot find where " they picked up this Name.

And towards the End of this Epiſtle, there is mention of a Diſtinction between pouring upon the *Clinicks*, and the *waſhing* of the other *Chriſ-*

& quod ſenſerit faciat. ——— in Sacramentis ſalutaribus, neceſſitate cogente, & Deo indulgentiam ſuam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt Divina Compendia. *Cyp. Ibid.* ad *Mag.*

* Nec quemquam movere debet, quod aſpergi vel perfundi videntur ægri, ——— porro autem quod quidam, eos ſalutari aquâ & fide legitimâ, Chriſti gratiam conſecutos, non Chriſtianos, ſed Clinicos vocant, non invenio unde hoc nomen aſſumant, *&c. Ibid.*

† Utrumne loti ſint, an perfuſi, utrumne Clinici ſint, an peripatetici, *Cyp. Ibid.* ſub finem.

tians, who had been baptized in the *regular* way, by *Dipping*.

And 'tis certain that they were againſt admitting *ſuch* to the *Miniſtry*, who had only receiv'd this *Clinick Baptiſm*, ſo that *Sprinkling* was but very poorly eſteemed of, in thoſe Days, and the Authority and Influence of *Cyprian*, could ſcarce make it go down with the People of *Africa*.

CHAP. VII.

Mr. W's *Reaſons for* Sprinkling, *and againſt* Dipping, *frivolous and uncharitable. His Pretenſions to Antiquity examin'd, moſt of his Teſtimonies* ſpurious, *or of no Weight. The two firſt Centuries of* Chriſtianity, *declare for the* Baptiſts. *One* unſcriptural *Practice leads to* another, *as*, pleading *the Neceſſity of* Infant-Baptiſm, *brought on* Infant-Communion.

TO follow my Author, it may be expected, that I ſhould take a little Notice, of the Reaſons, which induce Mr. *W.* to make Choice of *Sprinkling* before *Dipping*, which are to this Purpoſe; *In ſome Places*, he tells us, *and at ſome Times of the Year, Dipping would be very dangerous.* To which I anſwer, 1. Does he think that our bleſſed Lord did not know and conſider, the Conſequences of the Mode of this Ordinance, when he inſtituted it, and order'd it to be perform'd in all Nations, to the End of the World? Or are ſome Men in our Day grown more wiſe and wary, than the great Divine *Law-giver* himſelf? 2. I would fain know what they did in the Land of *Canaan*, and in other *Eaſtern Countries*, in cold Weather, for they have *Froſt* and *Snow* in their Seaſons, there; did they *dip* in warm Weather, and *ſprinkle* in cold Weather, according to the Variety of the

Seaſons? 3. How did it fare, with the People of theſe *Weſtern* Nations, even with *tender Infants* before *Queen Elizabeth*'s Time? for 'tis acknowledged on all Hands, that *Dipping* was the general Practice to Young and Old 'till *that Time.* 4. Does he imagine that his *Surmizes of Dangers* will paſs for Arguments? when the greateſt *Phyſicians* of the Age, who ſhould beſt underſtand *Cauſes* and *Effects* in our Conſtitutions, aſſures us, 'tis a *ſalutary* Practice; and conſequently they recommend *Dipping* at *all Seaſons* of the Year, in this *Climate*, for the Sake of *Health.* And now, whom ſhall we believe in this Buſineſs, a *Pædobaptiſt Writer* fill'd with *Prejudice* againſt this Practice, or Learned, profeſs'd *Phyſicians* who impartially conſult the *Common Good?* but Mr. *W.* inſinuates, *that many weak Conſtitutions, have ſuffer'd by unſeaſonable Dipping.* I anſwer, if he had known any *Inſtance*, that he *dar'd* have *ventur'd* to *publiſh*, of any who had *ſuffer'd* by being baptized *this way*, I am ſatisfied, he would have ſounded the Trumpet as *loud* as he could, nor would he conceal *ſuch a Thing*, as might have reflected any Degree of *Diſhonour* upon *this way.* Witneſs his painting out, to the *Reader*, a *vile Scene* conceived in his own Imagination, of baptizing People *ſtark Naked*, and that before a *mix'd Company* of Men and Women, p. 56. there he remarks upon the *immodeſt* Forwardneſs of *Women particularly, in appearing before others in looſe Garments*, in order to be *baptized.* But here, p. 55. he *works ſubtilly* upon

upon the *Paſſion* of *Fear*; that if poſſible, he may frighten *weak* and *timorous* People from their Duty, by urging that the *Health* of Perſons is *endanger'd*. He does not offer to pitch upon *any Inſtance*, leſt he ſhould be called upon to prove it, but his good Will is the ſame, for he leaves a baſe *innuendo* with the Reader, as if *many weak Conſtitutions had ſuffer'd by this Practice*. An excellent Specimen this, of the fulſome Grimace, of his *Preface*, *varniſhed* all over with *Charity!*

In the next Paragraph, we are told, that *when Perſons are dipp'd in Garments, it may happen that ſome Part of the Body ſhall not be touch'd with Water, and then there is not a total Immerſion.* No! ſure, if they are put under Water, they are immers'd, if the Water ſhould not touch the Skin, for Immerſion, I hope, does not conſiſt in Wetting, but in Dipping. What! is not a Stone immers'd, when thrown into the Bottom of a deep River, tho' the Water, by its moiſtening Quality, ſhould not reach the Inſide of it, even for a conſiderable Space? but if it ſhould be taken up again, in few Minutes, it may be ſaid, to have been *truely*, and *properly immers'd*. Let Mr. *W.* review this Sort of Reaſoning, and he will find his Objection very leaky, and will ſink of it ſelf. As to the ſubſequent Part of his Argument, upon this Head, I have fully conſider'd it, elſewhere, and therefore ſhall proceed to his next Objection.

OBJ. VII. *Infant-Baptiſm is a new Invention.* Here ſtill, the Reader is to remember, that 'tis

the Objection of the *Baptiſts*, as ſtated by Mr. *W.* But I muſt acquaint him, that the *Baptiſts* don't ſay, that 'tis a new Invention; on the contrary they confeſs, that 'tis an old Invention, even of 1400 Years ſtanding. Therefore this Practice can't in any Colour of Reaſon, in our Day, be called a new one. The Baptiſts indeed urge, and that with good Evidence, that this Buſineſs *is not of God*, nor any where to be found in his *written Word*. And 'tis this occaſions the Diſpute between the *Pædobaptiſts* and them.

Mr. *W.* undertakes to anſwer the Objection againſt the *Novelty* of the Practice, by referring us to Antiquity, particularly to Dr. *Cave's Primitive Chriſtianity*. Part I. Ch. 10. *to the Author of the Enquiry into the Conſtitution*, &c. Part II. from p. 44 to p. 55. to Dr. *Hammond's Tract of Infant-Baptiſm*, and to Mr. *Wall's Hiſtory*. Here, I may very well aſk, why did not Mr. *W.* ſingle out, ſome Proof from *genuine Antiquity*, as quoted by theſe very *Learned Writers*, and lay it before us? if he could in any of theſe *worthy Authors*, find competent *Proofs* of Infant-Baptiſm, within two *Hundred Years* after *Chriſt*, it would have been worth his while to have produced ſuch. This would have been ſomewhat effectual to his Purpoſe. But inſtead of this, we are put off with *Citations*, which are ſcandalouſly *precarious*, ſome out of *Suppoſitions or ſpurious Authors*, and others ſo late, as towards the *middle* or *latter* End of the *third*, if not the *fourth Century*.

Of the *former Sort* is that pretended one of

Juſtin

Juſtin Martyr, quoted by Mr. *W.* out of Dr. *Hammond*; but the Unhappineſs is, that Dr. *Hammond himſelf*, was not ſure who wrote that Book, *Reſp. ad Orthod.* he only calls it an *Ancient Piece*; and therefore a Quotation upon ſuch a doubtful and precarious Foot, can be of no Force with an impartial Reader: For if it be uncertain who writ a Book, and at what Time it was written, the *Credit* of that Book, as an *hiſtorical Evidence*, muſt ſink in Proportion.

Of the ſame Sort is *another* Citation brought by Mr. *W.* out of Dr. *Hammond*, viz. *that the Church had received Tradition from the Apoſtles, to give Baptiſm to Infants*; but Dr. *Hammond* confeſſes, that he is more uncertain about the *Author* of this Treatiſe than the other; and brings Mr. *Cauſabon* to vouch in the Dark for it; but it falls out, that he neither could tell who writ it, and he owns that there was a great Debate as to the *Author* of it, about the Year 420 after *Chriſt*.

Again, of the ſame Sort is another Quotation, taken by Mr. *W.* out of Dr. *Hammond*, from the *Conſtitutions*, Lib. VI. Ch. 15. but Dr. *Hammond* is at a great Plunge, who to make the *Author* or *Authors* of this *Work*, as any of the former; and to mend the Matter, there is No Body can tell when, nor by whom theſe *Conſtitutions* were written; and very few *Lear-*

* Dr. *Hammond*'s Queries, p. 251.

ned Men at this Time of Day, lay any Steſs on this Performance, but rather treat the Work with Neglect and Contempt, as to its being of an *Apoſtolick Original.*

Therefore ſuch Citations as theſe, are not likely to eſtabliſh any ſcrupulous *Pædobaptiſt*, nor ever to carry Evidence ſufficient with them, to convince any *profeſſed Baptiſt.*

Therefore I come to the *other Sort* of Teſtimonies produc'd by Mr. *W.* and they are from *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Auguſtin.* From *Origen*, as cited by the excellent *Author* of the *Enquiry*, Part II. p. 45. where I obſerve, that they are not the Words of *Origen* himſelf, but the Expreſſions of a *Tranſlation* made of him, and there are *grievous* Complaints among Learned Men, about the Tranſlations of this *Father (Origen)* in *particular*: That his Works are ſo *corrupted*, *alter'd* and *interpolated*, that a Man ſcarce knows, whether he reads *him*, or ſome *other officious Commentator*, in his *Room.* *Grotius* ſays, a great Deal of what is aſcribed to him, is an *unknown Author's*, and *a great Deal interpolated.* And *Huetius* ſays, that his Works are *deform'd* by *preverſe Interpretations.* There are *divers others*, who complain to the ſame Purpoſe, as the Reader may find in Dr. *Gale's Reflections*, more at large. Particularly Mr. *Du Pin* ſays, *thoſe Pieces we have in Latin, are tranſlated by* Ruffinus *and others, with ſo much Liberty, that it is a difficult Matter to diſcern what is Origen's own, from what has been foiſted in by the Interpreter.* Now, this is enough to diſcre-

discredit the Translations that are handed to us, of this *Father*; and his own proper *Greek Works*, are so far lost, that the most strict *Searchers* into his *Remains*, are not able to produce out of him any Thing in Favour of *Infant-Baptism*. But suppose that the Translation expresses the Sentiments of *Origen*, yet he does not pretend to ground Infant-Baptism upon any Revelation in the New Testament; but argues from some Passages in the *Old Testament*, out of *Job* and *Isaiah*, as his Fancy led him; for he imagin'd, that their Baptism would wash away Infants *Original Pollution*, and for this Reason he thought it was *necessary* to administer it to them; but he does not offer to plead one Word from *Christ's Institution*, or *any Example in the New Testament*: and withal, this *Father* flourished about 230 *Years* after *Christ*, and we allow that Infant-Baptism began to be introduc'd towards the *middle* of the *Third Century*. So that if this *Proof* was good and valid, it would very little affect the Controversy in Hand.

The next Citation we have, is that of *Cyprian* Anno 250. and here 'tis readily acknowledged, that he pleaded for Infant-Baptism; but then 'tis very strange, that an *African Bishop (Fidus by Name)* should be uneasy to know the proper Time, to *baptize Infants*, whether in the Compass of two or three Days, or the Space of *eight* Days after their *Nativity*; and that this should be a Business to be determined in a *Synod*. It gives every *impartial Enquirer*, very strong Ground of Suspicion, that this was a *novel Practice*,

Practice, at that Time, for the *Regulations* of it were not, it ſeems, well ſettled as yet. Whereas, if the Practice had been handed down, from the *Apoſtles Days*, as a great many confidently pretend, what Need were there of a *Synod* to determine the Time, when Infants might be baptized? Or, this *Biſhop* muſt be very indifferently qualified for the Duties of his Office, that he was no better acquainted with a Buſineſs of this Nature, himſelf. But when *new* Laws are *enacted*, People are commonly cautious *at firſt*, how they put them in *Execution*, and 'tis very probable *that this was the Caſe of Fidus.*

As to the laſt Teſtimony produced by Mr. *W.* out of Dr. *Hammond*, from St. *Auguſtin*, I freely confeſs it, but then St. *Auguſtin* lived in the *Fourth Century*, when Infant-Baptiſm had got ſtrong Footing, and it has held it from *that* Day to *this*. The *Baptiſts* never pretend to deny *theſe Things.*

What we expect and require of Mr. *W.* and the *Pædobaptiſts*, is to produce ſome *Vouchers* of received Authority, out of the *two firſt hundred Years*, for this Practice of *Sprinkling Infants*, which none of them have been able to do, *hitherto*. 'Tis an eaſy Matter to prove Infant-Baptiſm from the *Third Century downward*, but what we want, is to trace it *upward*, thro' the *Second* and *Firſt Centuries*, to the Days of the *Apoſtles*; and to give tolerable Evidence that they practiſed it. If any one can do this from Authentic Records, we ſhall be very thankful to him. 'Till this be done, 'twill be to little

Purpoſe

Purpoſe for Mr. *W.* to tell us, as he does, p. 59. *that many more Teſtimonies from Antiquity might have been added*; and a little lower, he ſays, *all the Streſs that he lays upon theſe Teſtimonies, is to ſhew, that they who lived in the Apoſtolic Age, and therefore had the beſt Advantage of knowing their Sentiments and Practice, in this Point, did themſelves practiſe Infant-Baptiſm; and declared it to be a divine Tradition.* I anſwer, would not any one think, from this grave Concluſion, that our Author *had effectually proved Infant-Baptiſm*, to be derived from the *very Apoſtles themſelves?* Whereas, on the Contrary, I have ſhewn from Dr. *Hammond*, whence Mr. *W.* took thoſe *Citations*, that the very Paſſages, they lay the *greateſt Streſs upon*, deſerve no Credit. Neither the *Authors*, nor the *Time* of writing theſe Paſſages can be found out, and Dr. *Hammond* himſelf, acknowledges all this. With what Face then, could Mr. *W.* urge it to his Reader, that theſe *Teſtimonies* came from ſuch as lived in the *Apoſtolic Age?*

Having now diſmiſs'd what Mr. *W.* had to offer from *Antiquity* in Defence of *Pædobaptiſm*, I come to conſider his *Surpriſe*, that the *Baptiſts*, the *Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm, ſhould pretend to Antiquity on their Side alſo*, p. 56. To which I anſwer, that I can ſcarce think, that he will diſpute *Sacred* Antiquity with us, I mean the *Hiſtorical Accounts*, which we have recorded in the *New Teſtament*. For as Things are left there, they ſpeak aloud in Favour of the *Baptiſts*, and there is not one Word of mention

tion made of *Pædobaptiſm*. Will he pretend that *John the Baptiſt* baptized *Infants?* let him and others conſider and examine all that is ſaid or written of that *great Man*; and they will find, that he baptized vaſt Numbers, even Multitudes, from *Jeruſalem* and *Judea*, and the *Regions round about Jordan, confeſſing their Sins.* Which ſhews beyond Contradiction, that they were *Adult Perſons* which he had to do with.

Again let the *Miniſtry* of our bleſſed *Lord* and his *Diſciples*, be narrowly examin'd, and there is not the leaſt Account of *Infants*, at any Time admitted to *holy Baptiſm*. Further, let the *Records* of the *Churches*, and of the *Acts of the Apoſtles* be conſulted, and there is not to be found the leaſt Footſtep, of Infants being baptiz'd, and admitted *Members of the Chriſtian Church*. But on the Contrary, the Nature of the Hiſtory, and the Account we have of the Conduct of the *Apoſtles*, in framing and modelling the *firſt Churches*, give no Ground to believe that Infants were baptized. There were many Thouſands of Men and Women, admitted to this Ordinance, and to the Lord's Supper, and expreſly ſaid to be *added to the Church*, but not *one Infant* reckon'd among all theſe. So that Mr. *W.* is utterly excluded all Manner of Claims to *Scripture-Authority*, whatever Succeſs he may hope to meet with in the *Eccleſiaſtical Accounts* of the following Ages of *Chriſtianity*. And tho' divers Innovations crept in, immediately after the Days of the *Apoſtles*, yet there are ſome *Remains* in the Writings of their

Succeſ-

Succeſſors, as to the Nature of the Ordinance of *Baptiſm*, and of the *Circumſtances of Perſons* ſubmitting to it in thoſe Days, which fairly determine Things in Favour of our *Perſwaſion*, and againſt *Pædobaptiſm*. And for this Reaſon, it may be very neceſſary to give the Reader ſome tranſient Taſte, of their Way of Speaking, and Reaſoning about Baptiſm, by which he may judge of their Sentiments in that Matter. And I ſhall inſtance in St. *Barnabas*, for this holy Writer having quoted ſome Paſſages of the *firſt Pſalm*, as particularly *he ſhall be like a Tree planted by the Rivers of Water, that bringeth forth his Fruit in his Seaſon.* —— obſerve, ſays St. Barnabas, *how he deſcribes the Water and the Croſs together.* "*for,* * *he ſays thus, they are bleſ-*
"*ſed, who placing their Hope on the Croſs, have*
"*gone down into the Water.*

And a little lower he cites a Paſſage out of the Prophet *Ezek.* Ch. 47. v. 12. *and by the River upon the Banks thereof, on this Side, and on that Side, ſhall grow all Trees for Meat, whoſe Leaf ſhall not fade, neither ſhall the Fruit thereof be conſumed:* &c. Whereupon St. *Barnabas* makes this Remark: "† *We go down into the*
"*Water full of Sins and Defilements, and come*

---

* Τύπο γὰρ λέγει. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν Σαυρὸν ἐλπίσαντες, καταβήσαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ.

† Ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπε, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἡμῶν τὸν φόβον καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχοντες ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. Barnab. Epiſt. Cap. II. Edit. Amſtel. 1724.

"*up*

" *up out of it, bringing forth Fruit in our Hearts,*
" *having Fear and Hope in Jeſus, in our Spirit.*

Again we may take a Paſſage or two out of St. *Hermas*, who ſpeaking of the Church, under the Emblem of a *Viſionary Tower*, and of the Stones which were of *different Sorts*, towards the *Building* of it. He ſays, * *Some fell beſides the Water, and could not be roll'd into the Water.*

In the ſeventh Section of the ſame Viſion we are told, whom theſe Stones repreſented. " †*But*
" *what are the reſt which fell by the Water-Side,*
" *and could not be roll'd into the Waters? they*
" *are ſuch as have heard the Word, and were*
" *willing to be baptized in the Name of the Lord;*
" *but when they call to mind what Holineſs the*
" *Profeſſion of Truth requires, they withdraw*
" *themſelves, and walk again according to their*
" *own wicked Deſires.*

Again we have a further Account in another Place —— where he is ſpeaking of the abſolute Neceſſity and *Mode* of Baptiſm, aſking this Queſtion, " ‖ *Why I ſay, have theſe Stones aſcen-*

---

* Alios cadentes ſecus aquam, nec poſſe volvi in aquam. *Sanct. Herm.* Lib. 1. Vis. 3. Sect. 2. Edit. Amſtel. 1724.

† Cæteri verò qui cadebant juxta aquas, & non poterant volvi in aquas, qui ſunt? ii ſunt, qui verbum audierunt, volentes baptizari in Nomine Domini, quibus cum venit in Memoriam Sanctitas veritatis, retrahunt ſe, ambulantque rurſus poſt Deſideria ſua Sceleſta. *Ejuſdem Lib. Sect.* 7.

* Quare, inquam, de profundo hi Lapides aſcenderunt,

&

" *aſcended out of the Deep, and are placed in the*
" *Building of this Tower?* —— *he ſaith 'tis*
" *neceſſary that they ſhould aſcend thro' Water, in*
" *order to reſt. They could not otherwiſe enter into*
" *the Kingdom of God. Therefore they being dead*
" *are ſealed with the Seal of the Son of God, and*
" *have enter'd into the Kingdom. For before a*
" *Man receives the Name of the Son of God, he is*
" *ordain'd to Death; but when he receives that*
" *Seal, he is freed from Death, and deliver'd unto*
" *Life: Now that Seal is Water, into which Men*
" *deſcend under an Obligation to Death, but aſ-*
" *cend out of it, being appointed to Life.* ——
" *They have deſcended therefore with them into the*
" *Water, and aſcended out of it with them again.*

The Reader may take the learned Mr. *Le Clerc*'s Notes, upon this laſt Citation, they are theſe. " * *They have deſcended with them into*
" *the Water, in the ſame Manner, in which Philip*

& poſiti ſunt in Structuram turris hujus? —— Neceſſe eſt, inquit, ut per Aquam habent aſcendere, ut requieſcant. Non poterant enim aliter in Regnum Dei intrare. Illi igitur defuncti, ſigillo Filii Dei ſignati ſunt, & intraverunt in Regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo, nomen Filii Dei, morti deſtinatus eſt; at ubi accipit illud Sigillum, liberatur a morte, & traditur vitæ. Illud autem Sigillum aqua eſt, in quam deſcendunt homines morti obligati, aſcendunt verò vitæ aſſignati. —— Deſcenderunt igitur in aquam cum illis, & iterum aſcenderunt. *Ejuſdem Lib.* 3. *Sect.* 16.

* Deſcenderuntque cum illis in aquam; eo modo, quo Philippus & Eunuchus *Acts* 8. 38. deſcenderunt in aquam, ut hunc ille baptizaret, atque ex aquâ aſcenderunt- *Ibid.*

" *and*

" *and the Eunuch went,* Acts 8. 38. *they deſcend-*
" *ded into the Water, that he might baptize him,*
" *and they aſcended out of the Water.*

Theſe are undeniable Paſſages, from Authors of received Credit, and who lived within the Compaſs of the *Firſt Century.* They clearly ſhew that the Perſons who were baptized were Adult, and that they went down into the Water to be dipped. Let Mr. *W.* or any other Pædobaptiſt produce as plain Inſtances of *Infants having been ſprinkled in that Age*; and if he can make ſuch a Diſcovery, 'twill deſerve the common Thanks of all the learned Advocates of *Pædobaptiſm.* No ſuch Thing having ever been done by any of them as yet.

I may now enquire a little, into the Teſtimonies of the *Second Century,* and they will appear to be unqueſtionable Vouchers for the Practice of the *Baptiſt-Churches* at this Day. That *famous* Paſſage of *Juſtin Martyr,* in his *Apology* to the *Emperor Antoninus Pius,* being the Place referred to, and cited in Part by Dr. *Whitby,* in his *Paraphraſe* on the *Commiſſion, Mat.* 28. will give ſufficient Satisfaction in this Point. And becauſe 'tis a *noted Piece,* and a *noble Monument of Chriſtian Antiquity,* I ſhall tranſcribe it, as far as it appears neceſſary to give Light into this Affair. His Words are theſe,

† " And now we will explain after what
" Manner, when we were renewed by *Chriſt,* we
" devoted

† Ὃν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ

" devoted our ſelves to God, leſt in omitting it, " we ſhould ſeem to prevaricate in our Rela- " tion. As many as are perſwaded, and be- " lieve that thoſe Things which we teach and " publiſh are true, and engage to live accor- " dingly, are admoniſh'd to addreſs themſelves " to God in Prayer and Supplication, with Faſt- " ing, for the Remiſſion of their paſt Sins; " while we faſt and pray together with them " We then bring them *where there is Water*, " and they are regenerated with the ſame Kind " of *New Birth*, wherewith we ourſelves were " *regenerated*; for they are then *waſhed in Wa-* " *ter, in the Name of the Father*, and Lord " God of the Univerſe, *and of our Saviour Je-* " *ſus Chriſt, and of the holy Spirit.* ——— And a little lower, he adds, " *the Reaſon of this (So-* " *lemnity)* we have received from the Apoſtles. ——— And a little further he ſays, "This *Waſh-* " *ing* is called Illumination, becauſe it imparts " Light to the Underſtanding of thoſe who

διὰ τοῦ χρισοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα, ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τὶ ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ πάντα τὰ ὑπ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὔχεσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντας παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. ἔπειτα ἀγόμεθα ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται: ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. &c. Justin. Lutetiæ Edit. *An.* 1551 *ex Officina* R. Stephani, *p.* 159.

Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον. *Ibid.* p. 160.

Καλεῖται

" learn theſe Things. So he, who is illumi-
" nated is waſhed in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt,
" who was crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, in
" the Name of the holy Spirit, which by the
" *Prophets*, did foretell whatever relates to *Je-*
" *ſus Chriſt.* —— In a Page or two further, he adds, " When the (new) Believer has declared
" his Conſent, and been thus *waſhed*, we bring
" him to thoſe *called the Brethren*, where they
" are aſſembled together, making fervent Sup-
" plications for our ſelves, for the Party lately
" enlighten'd, and for all others in what Places
" ſoever they be, that we may be judged wor-
" thy to learn the Truth, and by good Works
" to be found true Obſervers, and *Keepers* of
" the *Commandments*, and (at laſt) obtain *eternal*
" *Salvation.* Prayer being ended, we ſalute one
" another with an *(holy) Kiſs*. Afterwards,
" there is brought to the *Preſident* of the *Bre-*
" *thren*, ſome *Bread*, and a *Cup* of Water mixt
" with *Wine*, which having received, he gives
" Praiſe and Glory to the *Father of all Things*,
" through

Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται. *Ibid. pag.* 160.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον, καὶ συγκατατεθειμένον, ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος, καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως, ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν τὰ ἀληθῆ μαθόντες, καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ, καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι, ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν, ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν.

" through the *Name of the Son*, and of the *holy* " *Spirit*; he returns also many Thanks to *God* " for the worthy Things received from him. " Prayers and Thanksgiving being thus ended, " the whole Assembly signifies full Consent, by " saying, *Amen*; an *Hebrew* Word, which sig- " nifies, *So be it*. The President having return'd " Thanks (as aforesaid) and the Assembly decla- " red its Concurrence with a *loud Voice*, those " whom we call *Deacons*, distribute among the " Assistants, the *Bread*, and the *Wine* mixt with " Water, for which Thanks had been returned, " and they carry Part of them (even) to those " who are absent. This Food we call, *Eucha- " rist*, of which, 'tis not lawful for any to par- " take, *but for him who believes our Doctrine to " be true, and has been washed in the Laver of " Regeneration, for the Remission of Sins*, and " who does likewise live as *Christ* has comman-

 " ded;

εὐχῶν, ἔπειτα χροτφόρεται τῷ προεςῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος, καὶ κράματος καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει. καὶ εὐχαεισίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται. οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαεισίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν, τὸ δὲ τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ, τὸ γένοιτο, σημαίνει. εὐχαεισιτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεςῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάςῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαεισιηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαεισία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταδοχεῖν ἐξὸν ἐστὶν, ἢ τῷ πιςεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριςὸς παρέδωκεν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν. *Ibid.* pag. 161, 162.

" ded; for we don't take this *Food*, as *common*
" *Bread*, and *common Drink*.

We have here, a lively Deſcription of the Simplicity of the primitive Church, as well as of the Qualifications of their Members, and the Manner of admitting them, into their Communion. And if we conſult *Tertullian*, who flouriſhed about *Fifty* Years *afterwards*, we ſhall find this Account confirmed *in his Book concerning Baptiſm*. And indeed *he begins that Treatiſe* in a Manner that is *inconſiſtent* with *Infant-Baptiſm*. His Words are theſe; " † Our
" Sacrament of Water is a bleſſed one, becauſe,
" we, being cleanſed therein, from the Sins of
" our former State of Blindneſs, are made free
" unto eternal Life. —— And a little further he ſays, " No Body need aſk, whether we are
" dipp'd in thoſe very Waters, wherein they in
" former Times were? We are not *(dipp'd)* in
" thoſe *(very Waters)* unleſs it be in that Re-
" ſpect, wherein the *Genus* is the ſame, but the
" *Species* are divers. For the Quality that is
" attributed to the *Genus*, is abundantly to be
" found in the *Species*. Therefore 'tis no Mat-
" ter, whether a Perſon be waſhed in the Sea,
" or

† Felix Sacramentum Aquæ noſtræ, quia ablutis delictis priſtinæ cæcitatis, in vitam æternam liberamur.—— Nemo dicat, nunquid ipſis aquis tingimur, quæ nunc in primordio fuerunt? non utique ipſis niſi ex eâ parte, qua Genus quidem unum, Species verò complures: quod autem Generi adtributum eſt, etiam in Specie redundat: ideoque nulla Diſtinctio eſt, Mari Quis an Stagno, Flumine

" or in a Standing Pool; in a River, or in a " Fountain; in a Lake, or in the Channel of a " River: Nor is there any Diſtinction to be " made, between thoſe whom *John* dipped in " *Jordan*, and thoſe whom *Peter* dipp'd in the " *Tiber*, unleſs it be ſuppoſed that the Eunuch " whom *Philip* dipp'd in the Water, which " they happened to meet with on the Road " thereby obtain'd more or leſs Salvation. —— And in few Pages he adds, " that the Command " of Dipping is laid upon us, and the Manner " preſcribed. Our Lord ſays, go ye and teach " the Nations, dipping them in the Name of " the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy " Ghoſt. That Account may be compar'd " with this Command, unleſs a Man be born " again of Water and of the Spirit, he ſhall not " enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. He has " tied Faith to the Neceſſity of Baptiſm: there- " fore all who believed afterwards were dipp'd. —— And a little further, where he diſſwades

---

mine an Fonte, Lacu an Alveo diluatur, nec quicquam refert inter eos, quos Johannes in Jordane, & quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit. Niſi & ille ſpado quem Philippus inter vias fortuita aquâ tinxit, plus ſalutis aut minus retulit. *Tertul. Lib. de Bap. p.* 703. 704. *Edit. Baſ.* 1562.

Lex enim tingendi impoſita eſt, & forma præſcripta. ite (inquit) docete Nationes, tingentes eas, in nomen Patris, & Filii & Spiritus ſancti; huic Legi collata definitio illa; niſi Quis renatus fuerit ex aqua & Spiritu, non intrabit in Regnum Cœlorum: obſtrinxit fidem ad Baptiſmi neceſſitatem. Itaque omnes exindè credentes, tingebantur.

—— Itaque

from giving Baptiſm to Infants, he ſays thus, " Therefore according to every one's Condition, " and Diſpoſition and Age, the Delay of Bap- " tiſm is more profitable, eſpecially in Regard " to Infants. For what Neceſſity is there, for " Sureties to run any Riſk, ſince they may fail " of performing their Promiſes thro' their own " Mortality, and be deceived thro' the Untow- " ardneſs of thoſe that they promiſe for. Indeed " our Lord ſays, do not forbid them to come " unto me; let them come then, when they " are grown up, let them come when they " learn, when they are taught whither to come, " let them become Chriſtians when they are " able to know *Chriſt*. Why doth their inno- " cent Age haſten to the Remiſſion of Sins? " Men act more cautiouſly in Secular Affairs, " than to commit divine Things, to ſuch as " would not be entruſted with earthly Subſtance. " Let them know how to deſire Salvation, that " you may appear to give to him that aſketh. " —— If any rightly underſtand the Impor- " tance

---

—— Itaque pro cujuſque perſonæ conditione ac diſpoſitione etiam ætate cunctatio Baptiſmi utilior: præcipuè tamen circa parvulos; quid enim neceſſe eſt, ſponſores etiam periculo ingeri, qui & ipſi per mortalitatem deſtituere promiſſiones ſuas poſſunt: ait quidem Dominus, nolite illos prohibere ad me venire: veniant ergo, dum adoleſcunt, veniant dum diſcunt, dum quò veniant, docentur, fiant Chriſtiani quum Chriſtum noſſe potuerint. Quid feſtinat innocens ætas ad Remiſſionem peccatorum? cautius agetur in ſecularibus, ut cui ſubſtantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere ſalutem, ut petenti

" tance of Baptiſm, they will be more afraid " of the Accompliſhment of it, than the De- " lay of it. —— And towards the Cloſe of this Treatiſe, ſpeaking of the uſual Times of adminiſtring Baptiſm, being at *Eaſter* and *Whit-ſuntide* in ſome of the *Primitive Churches*, he ſays thus; " but every Day is the Lord's, Bap- " tiſm may be had at any Hour, and at any " Time. If there be a Senſe of the Solemnity, " there is no Doubt of the Grace of God. It " behoves thoſe who are entring upon Baptiſm, " to be frequent in Prayer, Faſting, and bend- " ing their Knees and watching to pray, with " Confeſſion of all their paſt Sins, that they " may explain the Baptiſm of *John*, of whom " 'tis ſaid they were dipp'd, confeſſing their " Sins.

Thus upon a fair Examination of theſe *Authors*, the Baptiſts may juſtly lay Claim to the Suffrage of the firſt two hundred Years. There is no Infant-Baptiſm to be found as approv'd of, in theſe Authors. But on the other Hand, there is ſuch a Deſcription of Chriſtian Baptiſm,

---

petenti dediſſe videaris. —— Siqui pondus intelligant Baptiſmi, magis timebunt conſecutionem quam dilationem. —— cæterum omnis Dies Domini eſt, omnis hora, omne tempus habile Baptiſmo. Si de ſolemnitate intereſt, de gratiâ nihil refert: ingreſſurus Baptiſmum, orationibus crebris, jejuniis & geniculationibus, & pervigiliis orare, oportet, & cum confeſſione omnium retro delictorum; ut exponant etiam Baptiſmum Joannis, tingebantur, inquit, confitentes delicta ſua, *Tertul. Ibid. p.* 710, 711.

and of the Perſons ſubmitting to it, and their Qualifications, together with the Places and Manner of Adminiſtration, as evidently appears to be inconſiſtent with the baptizing of Infants; and to confirm the Matter further, *Tertullian* offers ſtrong and clear Reaſons againſt this Practice, ſo that *Infants* are by him, *expreſsly ſaid*, to be utterly *unfit Subjects* for *this Ordinance.*

The Teſtimony of this *Father* is the more *remarkable* in this Caſe, becauſe he was a *Preſbyter* of *Carthage*, the *very City*, where *Cyprian* about *Fifty Years* afterwards preſided as *Biſhop*, and who may well be ſuppoſed to be *one* of the *firſt* that gave full Countenance to Pædobaptiſm in *Africa*, and the *very firſt* that *openly* pleaded for *Perfuſion* or *Sprinkling* in *any Country* whatſoever. For, as has been hinted already in his Epiſtle to *Fidus*, he endeavours to ſay Something of the *Time of baptizing Infants*, but in a poor Manner; and in his Epiſtle to *Magnus*, he attempts to give Satisfaction to the *African* Chriſtians about *Sprinkling*, for it ſeems they were ſurpriz'd at the *Newneſs* of the Practice, and gave the *odd Name* of *Clinicks*, to thoſe who were *ſo baptized*, And indeed 'twas no Wonder, that the *Africans* were affronted at, and made Light of this *Innovation*; for it was a very *wide* Step of *Variation* from the *firſt* Inſtitution of our *Lord*, to *make Uſe* but of a *few Drops* upon the *Head* or *Face*, inſtead of *burying* and *waſhing* the *whole* Body in *Water*. But 'tis ſtill more amazing, that Gentlemen of *Senſe*,

Probity

Probity and *great Learning* in our Day, and in their full *Health* and *Strength*, ſhould *tamely* content themſelves to have been *baptiz'd* after this *Invention* of *Cyprian*, which ſeem'd to be an *Expedient* calculated only for *Cripples*, or at leaſt for *Crazy*, *Bedrid* and *dying* People.

But upon a ſtrict View of the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, even after the Admiſſion of *Pædobaptiſm*, yet it was accounted by divers, but an *indifferent Thing*, which might be let alone. This is evident beyond Contradiction, from the Cuſtom of the Churches in thoſe Days, to adminiſter Baptiſm but twice a Year, and in ſome Places, but once. This ſhews they did not judge it neceſſary, *to give it to Infants newly born.*

What I now aſſert, is further confirm'd, by Inſtances we have recorded of *eminent Men*, who were deſcended from *Chriſtian Parents*, and yet *were not baptized in Infancy.* As *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Conſtantine*, *Ambroſe* and *Auguſtine.* What could be the Reaſon of this *Omiſſion?* 'tis a clear Argument to me, that the *Parents* either were not *fully ſatisfied* in the Practice, or that they laid *no great Streſs* upon it *at beſt.* But when Baptiſm came to be urg'd *as abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation*, Parents were *alarm'd* and *frighten'd*, this ſoon ſpread and promoted the Uſe of *Pædobaptiſm.* And St. *Auguſtine* is obſerved to be the *firſt*, who tranſported by his *Zeal* againſt *Pelagius*, had the *Boldneſs* to broach that *deſperate Doctrine*, of the *Damnation of Infants dying without Baptiſm.* Thus one Error frequently leads to another.

ther. A Perſwaſion of the Neceſſity of *baptizing Infants*, ſoon brought on the Cuſtom *of giving them the Euchariſt*. And *both theſe Practices* were founded, on a *miſtaken Senſe* of ſome Paſſages of *Scripture*. The *former*, on that Place of John 3. 5. *except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. The latter*, on thoſe Words of the *ſame Evangeliſt*; Ch 6. 53. *except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* And it ſeems, in Courſe of Time, Things were carried to *ſuch a Length*, that if an *Infant* was *dangerouſly ill*, there were ſome *Remains* of the *Euchariſt* reſerv'd *ready*, to be given him, leſt he ſhould *die* without it.

Thus, *Suicerus* informs us, his Words are theſe; " * This Cuſtom which was anciently " received, afterwards prevail'd ſo far, eſpe- " cially in the Time of *Charles the Great*, that " the *Euchariſt* was given to Infants, not only " in the *publick Aſſembly* of the *Church* after " *Baptiſm*, or at *other Times*, when the *Church* " was wont to come together to the *holy Com-* " *munion*: but ſome of the *Bread* of the *Lord's* " *Supper* was reſerved, to be given to *ſuch In-* " *fants* as were *ſick*, as well as *Adult Perſons*. " *An-*

* Mos hic receptus antiquitus, uſque adeo invaluit poſtea, maxime *Caroli M. Seculo*, ut non modo Infantibus Euchariſtia daretur in publico Eccleſiæ cætu poſt Baptiſmum, vel alio tempore, quo Eccleſia ad ſacram Synaxin convenire ſolebat: verum etiam panis cœna aſſervabatur parvulis ægrotantibus perinde ac adultis exhibendus. *Anſegiſus*,

" *Anſegiſe* an *Abbot* of *Leige*, who recites a " *Canon* of the ſaid *Charles* (in the firſt Book of " the Laws of the *Franks*, Chap. 145.) pub- " liſhed on this Account, gives us a very full " Teſtimony of it. For the Words of the *Ca-* " *non* are theſe: *Let a Presbyter have the Eucha-* " *riſt always ready, that when any Man is ſick,* " *or any Infant is weak, he may immediately* " *give it him, that he may not die without the* " *Communion.*"

Such was the Proſtitution of this Ordinance in the Time of *Charles the Great!* who liv'd about *Anno* 794. tho' the Seed of this Evil had been ſown long before, *i. e*, in *Auguſtin*'s and in *Cyprian*'s Days; and ſeem'd to be but the natural Conſequence of *Crying up* the *abſolute Neceſſity of baptizing Infants.*

ſegiſus, *Abbas Leodienſis*, qui *Canonem Carolinum*, Lib. 1. de Legibus *Francorum*, Cap. 145. ſuper hac re editum recitat, hujus nobis rei teſtis locuples eſſe poteſt. Sic enim Canon ille habet: *Preſbyter Euchariſtiam ſemper habeat paratam, ut quando Quis infirmatus fuerit, aut parvulus infirmus fuerit, ſtatim eum communicet, ne ſine Communione moriatur.* Suiceri Theſaur. Eccles. ſub voce σύναξις. Tom. 2. p. 1138.

Chap. VIII.

Mr. W*'s charging the Baptiſts with novel Practices and Opinions, ſhewn to be groundleſs and frivolous. The Vanity and Unfairneſs of ſome* Pædobaptiſt-Writers *of the laſt Age, in raiſing Calumnies againſt the Baptiſts. The Apoſtolic and Primitive Church unanimous for Dipping. Baptiſteries with Fonts in them to dip Men and Women, erected in ancient Times. Our Conformity to that laudable Practice. Divers Teſtimonies againſt Infant-Baptiſm, long before the Reformation by* Luther *and* Calvin. *Brief Hints of the Sufferings and Characters of ſome foreign* Anabaptiſts.

I come now to conſider an odd Sort of a Charge which Mr. *W.* advances againſt the Baptiſts, p. 60. *viz.* "that denying Baptiſm to "Infants, and rebaptizing ſuch as were baptiz'd "in Infancy, gain'd little Ground till after the "Year 1522." To which I anſwer, that there was no need of denying Baptiſm to Infants, 'till Some-body preſented or offer'd them to be baptized; as ſoon as that was done, 'twas denied them, as I have undoubtedly ſhewn from the Teſtimony of *Tertullian* already cited. For from the Days of the *Apoſtles* to his Time, we don't find that any pretended that Infants had a Right to Baptiſm, and conſequently they did not trouble them with it; and 'tis an eaſy Matter

ter to ſhew, that the Order of *Catechumeni*, *i. e.* the training up of young (or more aged) People in the Knowledge and Belief of the *Chriſtian Religion* before they were baptized, continued in the *Church* for ſeveral hundred Years after the *Apoſtles*. For tho' Infant-Baptiſm prevail'd in *Africa* and ſome other particular Places, yet according to the Accounts of very *learned* Men, it was not generally eſtabliſh'd, 'till the *Fifth Century*. 'Tis evident that this was the Cuſtom in the Dioceſe of *Milan*, in St. *Ambroſe*'s Time; and the Learned * Dr. *Allix*, who with great Pains and Exactneſs, had examin'd the State of this *Dioceſe*, ſays, that St. *Ambroſe* died *Anno* 397. after having poſſeſs'd the See of *Milan* twenty three Years. That he baptiz'd upon *Catechetic Inſtruction*, his own Words teſtify, which are theſe. " † Thou waſt aſked, doſt thou believe " in God the Father Almighty? thou ſaidſt, I " do believe and was dipp'd, that is, thou waſt " buried. Thou was aſked again, doſt thou " believe on our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, and his Cru- " cifixion? thou ſaidſt, I believe and was dipp'd " again, and ſo was buried with *Chriſt*. Thou " was aſked the third Time, do thou alſo be- " lieve in the *holy Spirit*? thou anſweredſt I be- " lieve, and was dipp'd the third Time.

---

* Remarks upon the ancient Church of *Piedmont*.

† Interrogatus es, credis in Deum patrem omnipotentem, dixiſti, credo, & merſiſti, hoc eſt, Sepultus es, *&c. Ambroſ. de Sacrament. Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 7.

But

But it is not my Buſineſs to defend this trine Immerſion, which obtain'd pretty early in the Church, and is frequently mention'd by ancient Writers, and was moſt certainly practis'd by many Primitive Chriſtians: 'tis abundantly ſufficient to my preſent Purpoſe, that here is an undeniable Account of baptizing People bred up in the Principles of *Chriſtianity*, and profeſſing their *Faith* in an *open Manner*, before they *received Baptiſm*; and that they were *dipp'd* is expreſly aſſerted: nor are the Words of St. *Ambroſe* capable of any other Meaning, *merſiſti & ſepultus es*; *thou haſt been dipp'd and buried.* To confirm this, was there any reaſonable Occaſion for it, the *ſame Father* gives us an exact Deſcription of the *Font* or *Pool*, wherein theſe *Catechumeni* were dip'd, on the *Profeſſion* of their Faith. His Words are theſe: " * *Yeſterday we* " *treated of the Font of Baptiſm, the Shape of* " which, is, as the *Form* of a *Sepulchre*, into " which, we, believing in the Father, Son and " holy Spirit, are received, are dipp'd, and riſe " again, that is, are rais'd again.

Now, if any Man ſhould have the Forehead to deny, that Perſons at this Time, and in this *Dioceſe*, *were dipp'd, on Profeſſion of their Faith, in the Ordinance of Baptiſm*, I ſhall pity him in-

* Heſterno die de Fonte baptiſmatis diſputavimus, cujus Species, veluti quædam Sepulchri forma eſt, in Quem, credentes in Patrem, & Filium & Spiritum ſanctum, recipimur, demergimur, & reſurgimur, hoc eſt, reſuſcitamur. *Ambroſ. de Sacrament. Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 1.

ſtead

ſtead of giving him any Anſwer. And thus, it ſeems, Things ſtood at the Period of near 400 Years after *Chriſt*.

Nor did theſe Things reſt here, for the Method of *Catechizing* was continued with great Care and Pains, in order to prepare Perſons for Baptiſm, and commodious *Baptiſteries* were built for the decent Adminiſtration of this *Ordinance*, and the *ſtated* Method of *Dipping* was religiouſly obſerv'd for a very conſiderable Time after the Days of *St. Ambroſe*, and may be trac'd down as low at leaſt as the *Sixth Century*. And Learned Men obſerve, that there are ſome *Remains* of *theſe Baptiſteries*, as Monuments of the *ancient Way of Baptizing* to be ſeen in *Italy* at this Day. They take Notice further that theſe *Baptiſteries* were without the Church, or diſtinct *Buildings* and *Apartments*. To confirm this, I ſhall offer the Authority of the late excellent *Antiquary*, the Reverend Mr. *Joſeph Bingham*, in his very learned and *elaborate* Works, *Origines Eccleſiaſticæ*. Where ſpeaking of this Cuſtom, he has theſe Words, " || So " that the firſt Ages all agreed in this, that " whether they had Baptiſteries or not, the " Place of Baptiſm was always without the " Church. And after this Manner Baptiſteries " continued to the ſixth Age, as appears from " what *Durantus* obſerves out of *Gregory* of

---

|| Vid. Origin. Eccleſ. Vol. I. Book VIII. Chap. 7. p. 309.

" *Tours*,

" *Tours*, that he ſpeaks of Baptiſteries ſtill " without the Walls of the Church. —— And " the Baptiſtery of St. *John Lateran* at *Rome*, " is ſtill after the ancient *Model*, if *Durantus* " rightly informs us,

It may not be amiſs to obſerve to the Reader in this Place, that there was a real Difference between a *Baptiſtery* and a *Font*. The Baptiſtery was a Building (without the Walls of the Church) which contain'd the *Font*. And we are aſſured from the learned *Author*, but now mention'd, that theſe outward Buildings, called the *Baptiſteries*, were in ſome Places very large. His Words are as follow, " * Theſe Baptiſte- " ries were anciently very capacious, becauſe as " Dr. *Cave* truly obſerves, the ſtated Times of " Baptiſm returning but ſeldom, there were " uſually great Multitudes to be baptized at the " ſame Time. And then the Manner of bap- " tizing by *Immerſion* or *Dipping* under Water, " made it neceſſary to have a *large Font* likewiſe. " Whence the Author of the *Chronicon Alexan-* " *drinum*, ſtiles the Baptiſtery, whither *Baſi-* " *liſcus* fled to take Sanctuary, μέγα φωτιςήριον, " the great *Illuminary* or *School* of Baptiſm. " And in *Venantius Fortunatus*, it is called *Aula* " *Baptiſmatis*, the large *Hall* of Baptiſm; " which was indeed ſo capacious, that we " ſometimes read of *Councils* meeting and ſitting " therein." —— And a little further he adds

* Origines Eccleſiaſticæ. Ibid.

" For

" for the *Baptiſtery*, properly ſpeaking, was the " whole Houſe of Building, in which the Font " ſtood, and where all the Ceremonies of Bap- " tiſm were perform'd; but the Font was only " the Fountain, or Pool of Water, wherein " Perſons were immers'd or baptiz'd, *&c.*

I may now very ſeaſonably remark the plain Aſſimulation there is, in the Practice of the preſent Baptiſt-Churches (in *Great-Britain*, *Ireland*, and ſome of his Majeſty's Foreign Plantations) to the laudable Cuſtom of the *Ancients*. They had their *Baptiſteries* and *Fonts*, ſo have we in divers Places. There are two in the Vicinity of the great and flouriſhing City of *London*, the one having its Baſon or Font in a Court Yard, under the open Heavens, with Conveniency for the Flux and Reflux of fair and freſh Water at Pleaſure; there are likewiſe ſuitable Accommodations, and *diſtinct Apartments* for *Men* and *Women*, with proper *Habits* prepared, to ſecure the utmoſt *Decency* and *Chriſtian Solemnity* in the Adminiſtration of this *Sacred Ordinance*. Nor are Strangers, Young or Old, if they behave with Gravity, forbid or prevented a Sight of the Adminiſtration. The other *Baſon* or Font, is in the Body of a handſome Meeting-Place; which is ſtatedly uſed for Divine Service. And I know where there are Conveniencies of this Nature, in other Parts and *Counties* of *England*. But then I would readily acknowledge, that where they are not furniſh'd with the *like Accommodations*, they do as the *earlieſt Chriſtians* undauntedly did, *i. e.* go to a

River, *Brook* or *Pool* of *fair Water*, and there diſcharge a good Conſcience towards God, in ſubmitting to their Duty in the Face of the *Sun*; having the *Baptiſm of John*, and of our *Lord Chriſt* in the River *Jordan*, as a ſufficient *Authority* to bear them out. And it ſeems to me clear, that ſuch was the Simplicity of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, that they proceeded in this plain Way for a conſiderable Time after the Apoſtles Days. And perhaps it will be a difficult Matter to prove that they had any *artificial Baptiſteries* built, in *Juſtin Martyr*'s, or indeed in *Tertullian*'s Time, about *Fifty Years* afterwards. For the *Former* talks of *leading the Catechumen, to a Place where there was Water*; and the *Latter* juſtifies baptizing in *Rivers, Ponds, Lakes*, or in the *Edge of the Sea it ſelf*, and aſſures us that the Water of the *Tiber*, was every way as good as that of *Jordan*. All this is evident from the Citations already produc'd from theſe *Authors*. And 'tis natural to conclude, that each of them ſpoke of the *common and ſtated Practice* of the Age wherein he liv'd.

And now it may be neceſſary to make theſe brief Remarks.

I. Theſe Teſtimonies put together are a flat Contradiction to Mr. *W*'s ſtrange Interpretation of the *Commiſſion*, as if Perſons were to be baptiz'd *firſt* without any *Inſtruction*, and ſo be *taught afterwards*. The *Primitive Church* knew nothing of ſuch a Siniſter and raſh way of proceeding.

2. I obſerve the Artifice of *Learned Men* ſince the

the *Reformation*, in raiſing ſo much Duſt, under a Pretence of finding out the Original of the *Baptiſts*. What a Pother have our Engliſh Writers of the laſt Age, made about this Buſineſs, as if they had never heard or read of *Dipping* Perſons *in their Baptiſm, on Profeſſion of Repentance!* How have *Dipping* and *Plunging* been *hooted* and *ridicul'd*, as if ſuch Things were unheard of in the World till theſe *Two laſt Centuries!* 'Twas not but that ſuch *learned Gentlemen* did underſtand *Antiquity*, as well, and better than any of their Neighbours; but how thick was the Paint laid on, to amuſe the Vulgar! as if the *Baptiſts* had ſprung from *infamous Wretches*, whoſe Oppreſſions indeed, as well as Enthuſiaſm, had made them and others mad, in ſome of the Cities of *Germany* about *Luther*'s Time! could our learned Adverſaries find no *elder Date*, nor a more honourable *Stem*, whence they might account for the Extraction of the Baptiſts?

Let the honeſt Reader impartially look back, to the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*, he will find nothing elſe there but baptizing by *Dipping* in *Jordan*, or other *Rivers* and *Places*, where there was *much Water*, to anſwer that End. Again let him pleaſe to review the Ages immediately ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*, this religious Cuſtom was punctually obſerv'd, and openly confeſs'd and couragiouſly defended before the *Emperor* and *Senate of Rome*; as may be ſeen in the famous *Apology* of *Juſtin Martyr*, referred to already. Further, would any one be inform'd,

who publickly oppos'd the introducing of *Infant-Baptiſm* into the *Chriſtian Church*, 'twas that *great Carthaginian Preſbyter (Tertullian by Name)* whoſe memorable Writings will be an everlaſting Teſtimony againſt that *unſcriptural*, and (as he will have it) *irrational* Practice. Upon theſe Conſiderations, the *Baptiſts* need not in the leaſt to be aſhamed of their Original, nor of the *venerable Authority* upon which they act. Nay, they may venture to vie with their *Pædobaptiſt-Neighbours*, and even challenge them to produce but a tenth Part of ſo good Evidence for their Practice.

But I have a Jealouſy that Mr. *W.* would willingly compound with us, and overlook the earlieſt Antiquity becauſe it makes, thro' the Succeſſion of many hundred Years, ſo directly againſt him; and ſo would fain confine our View, to the Year 1522; about which Time, he is willing to acknowledge, that the *Baptiſts* began to appear. Now, whether it be, that Mr. *W.* only takes upon him to know no better, or that he is not duely inform'd of the true State of the *Primitive Church*, I ſhall not pretend to determine. However I may hint briefly, how Things ſtood at the Period which he himſelf choſes to fix for the *firſt Riſe* of the *Baptiſts*, *i. e.* about the Year 1522.

1. Let it be obſerv'd, that at this Time, *Great-Britain* lay in the profound Darkneſs of *Popery*. And it is worth noting, that *Dipping* was the general Practice, ſo that the whole Nation conſiſted of *Baptiſts*, in this ſtrict Senſe,

they

they had been all dipp'd in their Baptiſm. If any one queſtions this, he may ſatisfy himſelf in peruſing the excellent Works of the learned Knight *Sir John Floyer*, who proves this Point beyond Contradiction. A Practice, which continued in the Church above 1300 Years, but is at this Day (thro' Inconſideration) laugh'd at by half the Kingdom; ſo wanton and fickle are the frothy Humours of ignorant Men!

The Precedency which *Luther* and *Zuinglius* got in the Reformation abroad, is but very inſignificant; eſpecially ſince the *Riſe* of them, and of the Baptiſts being *compar'd*, will appear to be thus: *Theſe* began to preach openly againſt the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, in the following Gradations, *viz.*

Luther in the Year - - - - - -	1517
Zuinglius - - - - - - - - -	1519
The Baptiſts - - - - - - - - -	1522

That this is a juſt Repreſentation of the Caſe, may be ſeen from that faithful *Dutch* Hiſtorian *Gerard Brandt*; his Words are theſe, " * The " Reformation excluſive of Infant-Baptiſm, was " ſet on Foot in *Swiſſerland*, about the Year " 1522 by the Zeal of *Conrad Grebel* and *Fælix* " *Mans*, *both* Men of *Learning*, who fell out " with *Zuinglius* about the ſaid Opinion. But we are told that this *Falling out* coſt them very dear, for the Hiſtorian informs us in the next Paragraph, that, " upon Account of this Dif- " ference, was the *firſt Edict* againſt *Anabap-*

" *tiſts*, publiſhed at *Zurich*; in which there " was a Penalty of a *Silver Mark*, or two " *Guilders* Dutch *Money*, ſet upon all ſuch, as " ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be re-baptiz'd, or " ſhould with-hold Baptiſm from their Chil- " dren. And it was further declared, that " thoſe who openly oppos'd this Order, ſhould " be yet more ſeverely treated. Accordingly, " the ſaid *Fælix* was drown'd at *Zurich*, upon " the Sentence pronounc'd by *Zuinglius* in theſe " four Words, *Qui iterum mergit, mergatur*; " that is, he that re-baptizes with Water, let " him be drowned in the Water. This hap- " pen'd in the Year 1526. but about the ſame " Time, and ſince, there were more of them " put to Death: A Procedure that appear'd very " ſtrange to ſome." Strange indeed! and very melancholly Times! that a *Proteſtant* and a *Miniſter* too, ſhould pronounce a *barbarous* and *inhuman* Sentence upon his *Brother*, for diſputing againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*: a Thing which at beſt, has but ſome dark Tradition to ſupport it. For there is not one *ſingle Text* in the *whole Bible* that will plainly warrant it, and many *Pædobaptiſts* confeſs ſo much.

But if Mr. *W.* will judge of the Truth of Opinions and the Soundneſs of Parties by their exiſting or not exiſting about the Year 1522. I am afraid that the *Proteſtant Religion* it ſelf, will ſtand but a poor Chance in his Eſteem. And that he will be much puzzled to defend the Orthodoxy of the *Reformation*. For I have obſerved already that *Great-Britain* lay faſt aſleep, within

within the dark Curtains of Popery, to ſhade off the Light of the Goſpel from ſhining into it, as yet. And it was about this Time, that *Henry the Eighth, King of England* acquir'd from the Pope the *Title* of *Defender of the Faith*, for writing againſt *Luther* and the *Reformed Religion*. And pray, is it not a common Queſtion for *Papiſts* to put to *Proteſtants*, where was *your Religion* before *Luther*? and is it not common for the *Proteſtants* to anſwer, *truly, it was in the Bible*. The Application is eaſy, if Mr. *W.* aſks, where was *our Doctrine* before 1522? We anſwer, 'twas in the *New Teſtament*, in the *Commiſſion of our Lord* and elſewhere, and will remain there as long as the Earth remains.

'Tis ſo interwoven in the *Pages* of the *Goſpel*, like *Phidias*'s Shield in the *Statue*, that it can't be eras'd, having the Sanction of a ſpecial Promiſe of *Chriſt*'s *Preſence* with thoſe who accordingly ſubmit to their Duty, *alway even to the End of the World*.

But leſt Mr. *W.* ſhould be too much elated, and look down upon the poor Baptiſt-Congregations in *England* and *Wales*, with Contempt, by over-rating the *Seniority* of his own *Denomination*, and undervaluing *theirs*, it may not be improper to give a ſhort comparative View of their reſpective Standings. Every Body knows that the *Church of England* ſeparated from the *Church of* Rome, in the Reign of *King Edward the Sixth*, and in the Beginning of *Queen Elizabeth*'s. And tho' the *Puritans* of thoſe Days diſagreed to many of their ways and *Ceremonies*,

yet the different Orders of *Diſſenters*, under the preſent Denominations, did not *take Riſe* till ſome Years afterwards And according to the elaborate Examination of the Reverend and Learned *Mr. Neal*, their gradual Succeſſions will appear thus, *

The firſt *Engliſh Presbyterian* Church was conſtituted *Anno* - -	1573
Firſt *Independant* - - -	1616
Firſt *Baptiſt* - - - -	1640

If there be any Miſtake in theſe Calculations I ſhould be glad and thankful to be better inform'd. Nor can I diſcern what Improvement may be made of any pretended Antecedency of *Date*, in this Caſe. For if Mr. *W.* ſhould think he has ſome Advantage over the *Baptiſts* in this Point, the *eſtabliſh'd Church* has the like over him. But if that ſhould be thought of any Service, 'tis plain there were ſome *Exile-Anabaptiſts* in *England* in *Henry the Eighth's* Time, as is evident from *Brandt's* Account. His Words are theſe, "† In the Year 1539 there "were put to Death at *Delft*, one and thirty "*Anabaptiſts*, that fled from *England*; the "Men beheaded, and the Women drowned.

About this Time the Perſecution was very ſevere againſt them abroad, and they hoped to

---

* Mr. *Neal's* Hiſt. Pur. Vol I. p. 301. Vol. II. p. 108. 392.

† Brandt's Hiſt. Refor. Vol. I. B. 3 p. 77.

find

find more favourable Quarters in *England*, but it ſeems they were greatly miſtaken. For *King Henry the Eighth* had drawn up with his own Hand, a little before this fell out, a very *hard Proteſt* againſt *them* and *Pelagians* in particular. The Article runs after this Manner. " * That Baptiſm was a Sacrament inſtituted by " *Chriſt*, that it was neceſſary to Salvation, that " Infants were to be baptiz'd for the Pardon of " Original Sin, and that the Opinions of the " *Anabaptiſts* and *Pelagians* were deteſtable He- " reſies.

So that theſe unhappy People being diſappointed of a peaceable Settlement in *England*, were forc'd to try the Event once more *abroad*, but their Lot was according to the known Proverb, *Out of the Frying-Pan into the Fire.*

However 'tis certain that there was a ſeparate Congregation, form'd of foreign *Anabaptiſts* in *London* in the very next Reign. So *Brandt* aſſures us. " † that in the Year 1553, the " *Low-Country Exiles*, who in the Time of " *Edward VI.* had gathered a Congregation at " *London* (which upon his Death was diſperſed " by *Queen Mary*) after a dreadful Northern " Journey in which they ſuffered ſo much from " the *Lutherans*, found at *Wiſmar* two diſtinct " Communities of *Anabaptiſts.*"

I deſign no more by theſe Things, than to

---

* Mr. *Neal's* Hiſt. Pur. Vol. I. p. 22.

† Hiſt. Refor. Vol. I. Book IV. p. 104.

con-

convince Mr. *W.* and others that *Anabaptiſm* has the Precedency as to Date, of either *Presbytery* or *Independency* in this Nation. And to argue for the Soundneſs of Principles in any Party upon ſuch a Foot, is a poor way of Reaſoning. I would obſerve further that the true Occaſion why the *Engliſh Baptiſts* could no ſooner form themſelves into Societies, was, becauſe of the violent Perſecution of *Puritans* of all Sorts: And the *Baptiſts* could expect but the leaſt Favour in thoſe Times, becauſe they differ'd from the *Eſtabliſhment* in a *Point*, wherein *others* did not. However, there were Numbers of this Perſwaſion, long before they could ſettle in ſeparate Congregations; this is evident from the judicious and learned *Capt. Richard Dean*, in his Letter to the late Right Reverend *Dr. Barlow*, *Biſhop of Lincoln*, who, by the Way (whilſt in his private Station at leaſt) was no Enemy to the Baptiſt-Principle. The Letter has theſe Words, " * I have been inform'd " by credible Perſons of ſome of this Sect be- " ing in your Lordſhip's Dioceſe, in and long " before the Reign of King *James the Firſt.* " And I have ſeen an humble Supplication (re- " printed *Anno* 1662, with another ſhort Trea- " tiſe, entituled, *Perſecution for Religion judged* " *and condemn'd*, but before printed, *Anno* 1620.) " preſented to King *James*, and the Parliament " then ſitting, which ſets forth among other

* Captain *Dean*'s Letter to the Biſhop of *Lincoln*, p. 4. Edit. 1693.

Things,

" Things, that their Miſeries were long and " lingring Impriſonments for many Years, in " divers Counties of *England*, and concludes " thus, we ceaſe not to pray for the King, and " his Son, and his Seed, and this whole high " and honourable Aſſembly; now and always " calling the All-ſeeing God to witneſs, that " we are your *Majeſty's Loyal* Subjects, not for " Fear only, but for Conſcience Sake, unjuſtly " called *Anabaptiſts*, &c. All the Remark I make at preſent, is this, here is an eminently *Loyal* and *Chriſtian* Spirit Breathing in the *Baptiſts* of theſe early Times, when under very great Hardſhips, and while as yet they were not ſuffer'd to worſhip God according to their *Profeſſion* in diſtinct Societies.

Having briefly ſuggeſted theſe Things concerning the Baptiſts in *England* and *Wales*, for I can manifeſtly prove the Riſe of them in both thoſe Places, to be, much about the ſame Time; I muſt return to offer ſomewhat further in the Caſe of *Foreigners*, eſpecially ſince Mr. *W.* has ſo peremtorily fix'd the *Æra* of them to the Year 1522. And I think it will be generally allowed by ſuch who know any Thing of the State of the *Chriſtian Church*, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, whom we now call *Popes*, did, about the *Sixth Century*, uſurp a *Supreme Power*, and erect a certain Spiritual Dominion over the greateſt Part of *Chriſtendom*; ſo that the Purity of Doctrines, Ordinances aad Manners, was in a great Meaſure loſt; and amongſt other Things, the primitive Simplicity of *Baptiſm*, was ſtrangely

ſtrangely alter'd, by ſtuffing this Ordinance out with Salt, Oil, Spittle and other ſuperſtitious Inventions, as if it came too plain and ſimple from the Hands of our *Saviour* and his *Diſciples*. Nay, to ſuch an exquiſite Dexterity did ſome of the *Romiſh* Clergy arrive, in the Management of *Infant-Baptiſm*, as to baptize Children in *Utero*. However the general Corruption ſpread it ſelf far and wide. And perhaps, the Chriſtians in the Dioceſe of *Milan*, the *Subalpini*, and thoſe in the *Valleys of Piedmont* eſcap'd the beſt of any *Churches*, and held it for the Series of *ſeveral Ages* together. Tho' they waded thro' Rivers of Blood, yet they *quitted themſelves like Men, kept the Faith, and came off more than Conquerors*. I ſhall confine my ſelf principally, in giving only ſome ſhort Hints of thoſe in the *Valleys* of *Piedmont*, commonly called *Waldenſes*. And the firſt Obſervation I would make, is this, that the current Opinion is, that theſe People have deriv'd both their *Name* and Religion, from one *Peter Waldo*, an Inhabitant of *Lyons*, who began to ſpeak openly againſt Papacy about the Year 1159 or 1160. But whoſoever will take the Pains to peruſe the learned *Remarks* of Dr. *Allix* on theſe Churches, will find, I think, unanſwerable Arguments whereby he proves that theſe People held the Purity of Doctrine from Father to Son, for many Years, if not Ages before *Peter Waldo* appear'd in the World. The Affinity of the Names of *Wallenſes* and *Waldenſes*, might eaſily be the Occaſion of the Miſtake. Dr. *Allix* ſays,

* "That

" * That the Name of *Wallenſes* or *Vaudois* was " given them from the Place of their Abode, " which the Inhabitants called, *les Vaus de Lu-* " *cerne & Angrogne*, that is to ſay, the *Valleys* " of *Lucerne* and *Angrogne*, from whence came " the *Latin* Name *Vallenſes*, which was after- " wards chang'd to *Valdenſes*, &c.

The Learned Dr. in the foregoing Pages had deliver'd his Thoughts about the true *Antiquity* of theſe *Waldenſes* wherein he repreſents *Beza*, as agreeing likewiſe that their *Religion* was of an *Apoſtolic Original*. His Words are theſe, " * The Biſhop of *Meaux* highly chargeth " *Beza* for ſaying, that the *Waldenſes* Time " out of Mind, had ſtifly oppos'd the Abuſes of " the *Romiſh Church*, and that they held their " Doctrine from Father to Son, ever ſince the " Year 120. And a little lower he adds, the " Reader who has perus'd my Obſervations, " will be able to judge whether the *Waldenſes* " did falſely boaſt of their *Apoſtolical Antiquity*.

Mr. *Brandt* is of the ſame Opinion in Favour of their ancient Religion, and ſays, " † That the Errors and crafty Inventions of " *Popery*, had never been able to find a Paſſage " to thoſe People; ſince being ſhut up in their " *Valleys* ſeparate from the reſt of the World, " and converſing chiefly among themſelves,

---

* Remarks on the ancient Churches of *Piedmont*, p. 179.

† Dr. *Allix* Ibid. p. 157. 177.

‖ *Brandt's* Hiſt. Ref. Vol. I. Book I. p. 12.

" they

" they had retain'd a great Deal of the Simpli-
" city and Purity of the *Apoſtolical Doctrine.*
" That this Antiquity of the Doctrine of the
" *Waldenſes,* is acknowledg'd even by their
" greateſt Enemies. —— that ſome of them
" rejected *Infant-Baptiſm.*

What I deſign particularly, is, to corroborate this laſt Clauſe, *i. e.* " to ſhew that there were " ſome Numbers, among *theſe Churches* and " others in *Italy,* who were againſt *Infant-* " *Baptiſm.*" I can't paſs by an Inſtance which Dr. *Allix* gives us, concerning *Gundulphus* and his Followers in *Italy,* many of whom *Gerard,* Biſhop of *Cambray* and *Arras,* examin'd upon ſeveral Heads in the Year 1025. And it ſeem'd as if theſe People were ſurfeited with the vitious and debauch'd Lives of the *Romiſh Clergy,* and did either chooſe to go without any Baptiſm, rather than to have it adminiſtred by ſuch lewd Hands, or that they had agreed to have it perform'd privately in their own Way. Let Things have been as they would, 'tis plain they were utterly againſt *Infant-Baptiſm.* The Citation, in Part of their Anſwer, as taken by Dr. *Allix* out of *Gerard*'s Preface to *Reginaldus,* is this, " * But if any ſhall ſay, that ſome " Sacrament lies hid in Baptiſm, the Force of " that is taken off by theſe three *Cauſes*; the " firſt

* Siquis autem in Baptiſmate aliquod dicat latere Sacramentum, hoc tribus ex Cauſis evacuatur. Una, quia Vita reprobata Miniſtrorum, Baptizandis nullum poteſt præbere

" firſt is, becauſe the reprobate Life of Mini-
" ſters, can afford no ſaving Remedy to the Per-
" ſons to be baptized. The ſecond, becauſe
" whatſoever Sins are renounc'd at the Font,
" are afterwards taken up again in Life and
" Practice. The third becauſe a ſtrange Will,
" a ſtrange Faith, and a ſtrange Confeſſion do
" not ſeem to belong to, or be of any Advan-
" tage to a *little Child*, who neither *wills* nor
" *runs*, who knows *nothing of Faith*, and is al-
" together ignorant of his own Good and Sal-
" vation, in whom there can be no Deſire of
" Regeneration, and from whom *no Confeſſion*
" *of Faith can be expected.*

I am the more confirm'd, in what I ſuggeſted of the *Waldenſes* lothing the Adminiſtration of Ordinances by the *Romiſh* Prieſts, becauſe of the ſhocking Vileneſs of their Lives, from the Acknowledgement of an *Inquiſitor*, who declares the ſame, of a Branch of theſe People driven by Perſecution into *Bohemia*. The *Inquiſitor*'s Words are theſe; " * They contemn the Sacra-
" ments of the Church, becauſe of the undue
" and irreverent Manner wherein they are ce-
" lebrated by many Prieſts, and becauſe they

---

præbere ſalutis Remedium. Altera quia Quicquid vitiorum in Fonte renunciatur, poſtmodum in Vita repetitur. Tertia, quia ad parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, Fidei neſcium, ſuæque ſalutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla Regenerationis petitio, nulla Fidei poteſt in eſſe Confeſſio, aliena Voluntas, aliena Fides, aliena Confeſſio nequaquam pertinere videtur.

* Dr. *Allix* Ibid. p. 223.

" ſet

" ſet them to Sale, as alſo becauſe of the wicked " and ſcandalous Lives of many Miniſters." In the next Paragraph the ſame *Inquiſitor* lets us know the Ground of their Error (as he calls it) about Infant-Baptiſm. " Some of them are " in an Error concerning Baptiſm, holding, that " Infants cannot be ſaved by it, *Mark* xvi. 16. " *whoſoever ſhall believe, and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* But an Infant does not believe, therefore is not ſaved.

The *famous Berengarius* of *Tours* who flouriſh'd about 1049 is repreſented as being againſt Infant-Baptiſm. That this was one of the Charges laid againſt him and his Followers, my *Author* ſays, " * Is evident from the Diſ- " courſe of *Guimondus* Biſhop of *Averſa* Lib. I. " *Contra Bereng.* where he accuſeth them of " overthrowing, as much as in them lay, Law- " ful Marriages and the Baptiſm of *Infants.*

In a little Time after this, liv'd the noted *Arnoldus Brixienſis*, who eminently oppos'd the *Romiſh* Corruptions, and he is ſaid to be of the Opinions of *Berengarius*, and particularly againſt *Infants-Baptiſm.* And amongſt ſome Notions imputed to him, 'tis obſerv'd, " †There " was yet a more heinous Thing laid to his " Charge, which was this; *Præter hæc de Sa-* " *cramento Altaris, Baptiſmo Parvulorum, non* " *ſanè dicitur ſenſiſſe.* *i. e.* " Beſides this it was

† Dr. *Allix*, Ibid. p. 123.
‖ Ibid. p. 171, 172.

" ſaid

" ſaid of him, that he was unſound in his Judg-
" ment about the Sacrament of the *Altar* and
" *Infant-Baptiſm.*"

This excellent Man was condemn'd, hang'd, and his Body burnt at *Rome*, and the Aſhes caſt into the *Tiber*.

There was another *Arnoldus* condemn'd and burnt at *Cologn* ſometime before this, about the Year 1163. He was among ſome of the *Waldenſes* who were then dreadfully perſecuted in *Flanders*, and fled as they thought for Safety towards *Cologn*. Which of theſe two *Arnolds*, gave the Name of *Arnaldiſts* to the *Waldenſes*, I will not pretend to determine. But this laſt mention'd and his Companions executed with him, did not ſeem to be any great Friends to *Infant-Baptiſm*. Mr. *Brandt* repreſents them thus, " It ſhould ſeem, that theſe *Piphles* (ſo the " *Waldenſes* were ſometimes termed) maintain'd, " among other Notions, that we ought chiefly " to be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt and with " Fire, for the *Abbot Egbert* writ afterwards, " that the People of *Cologn* had baptized *Arnol-* " *dus*, and thoſe of *Bon*, *Theodoricus* and his " Companions, with Fire.

But there is a Letter of *Evervinus* to St. *Bernard* a little before the Year 1140 wherein he ſpeaks clearly of a Sect, which approv'd of *Adult-Baptiſm upon believing*, and ſtrenuouſly oppos'd *Infant-Baptiſm*. The Words of the

* *Brandt's* Hiſt. Ref. Vol. I. B. I. p. 12.

Letter are theſe, " † They make void the " Prieſthood of the Church, and condemn the " Sacraments beſides *Baptiſm* only, and this on- " ly in thoſe who are come to *Age*, who, they " ſay are baptized by *Chriſt* himſelf, whoſoever " be the *Miniſters* of the *Sacraments*. They " do not believe *Infant-Baptiſm*, alledging that " Place of the Goſpel, *whoſoever ſhall believe* " *and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved.*"

And my *Author* obſerves, that St. *Bernard took* Occaſion from this very Letter to refute theſe *(pretended)* Hereticks, in his 65 and 66 Sermons upon the *Song of Solomon*. " And that " the beginning of his 65 Sermon contains a " manifeſt Alluſion to the beginning of this Let- " ter of *Evervinus*." And in his ſecond Sermon *(the* 66) he lays down ſome Part of their Opinions, and among other Things he accuſeth them " *Of looking upon themſelves as the only* " *Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, he accuſeth them of* " *mocking at Infant-Baptiſm.*

The ſame learned Author informs us, " *That " *Alanus* attributes to the *Cathari* almoſt the " very ſame Opinions, in his firſt Book againſt " *Hereticks*, which he wrote about the Year " 1192. And that under that general Name " which he gives them, he comprehends a great " Number of *Sects*, who differ'd from one ano- " ther in *Principles*, ſome of them being *Ma- " nichees*, others *Arrians*, and others again hold-

† Dr. *Allix* Ibid. p. 143, 145. 147.
* Ibid. p. 155.

" ing

"ing the Opinions of the *Reformed* or *Proteſ-*
"*tants.* Some of the Opinions of theſe latter,
"you may ſee in what follows. He affirms
"that ſome of theſe Hereticks believ'd that
"*Baptiſm is of no Uſe to Infants*, becauſe they
"were not guilty of any Sin; and that othets of
"them held, that it was of no Uſe, but *only to*
"*thoſe who were of Age:* —— he ſays that
"ſome of them held, that *That* Sacrament was
of no Uſe, without *Impoſition of Hands.*

I further take Notice that the ſame learned Gentleman gives us, an Extract taken by *Claudius Couſſord* in the Year 1548, out of an old MS. of *Raynerius* a *Fryer*, writ by him 296 Years before, againſt the *Waldenſes*, wherein he has theſe Words, "|| They ſay, that then firſt
"a Man is baptiz'd when he is received into
"their *Sect.* Some of them hold, that Baptiſm
"is of no Advantage to Infants, becauſe they
"cannot actually believe."

The late Reverend Mr. *Joſeph Stennett* in his Anſwer to *Ruſſen*, has I think given ſufficient Proof, that the *Albigeois* as well as the *Vaudois* or *Waldenſes*, were againſt *Infant-Baptiſm.*

The Citation as taken and tranſlated by Mr. *Stennett* out of *Chaſſanion's* Hiſtory of the

---

|| Tum primò hominem baptizari dicunt, cum in eorum Sectam fuerit inductus. Quidam eorum Baptiſmum Parvulis non valere tradunt, eo quod nondum actualiter credere poſſunt.

Apud Dr. *Allix*, Ibid. p. 188. 191.

Albigeois, has theſe Words, " * I cannot deny " that the *Albigeois* for the greateſt Part were of " that Opinion (*i. e.* againſt Infant-Baptiſm) and " that which confirms me yet the more in the " Belief of it, is, that in the Hiſtory of the " City of *Treves*, there were ſome who denied " that the Sacrament of Baptiſm was available " to the Salvation of *Infants*. And one *Catherine Saube*, who was burnt at *Montpellier* in " the Year 1417 for being of the Mind of the " *Albigeois*, in not believing the Traditions of " the *Romiſh Church*, had the ſame Thoughts " concerning *Infant-Baptiſm*. ——— " The " Truth is, they did not reject this Sacrament, " or ſay it was uſeleſs, but only counted it un- " neceſſary to Infants, becauſe they are not of " Age to believe, or capable of giving Evidence " of their Faith. Upon which Mr. *Stennet* leaves his Remark, in theſe Words, " that this " Hiſtorian who was a *Pædobaptiſt*, and who " ſays he collected this Hiſtory from two an- " cient Manuſcripts, *one* of which was written " in the *Languedoc* Tongue, and the *other* in " *Old French*, declares himſelf convinc'd that " the greateſt Part of the *Albigeois* were againſt " *Infant-Baptiſm*.

Mr. *Stennet* further adds out of *Caſſander*'s Preface to his Book of Infant-Baptiſm, that this Principle was imputed by that learned Author to *Peter de Bruis* and his Diſciple *Henry*, from

* Mr. *Stennett*'s anſwer to *Ruſſen*, p. 82, 83.

whom

whom the *Petrobruſians* and *Henricians* took their Name, the Words of *Caſſander*, in ſpeaking of their Doctrine, are theſe, * " Which " Hereſy firſt openly condemn'd Infant-Bap- " tiſm, and ſtifly aſſerted that Baptiſm was fit " only for the *Adult*, which (*Doctrine*) they " both verbally taught, and really practiſed in " their Adminiſtration of Baptiſm.

I ſhall tranſcribe one Inſtance more from my late learned Friend, Mr. *Stennett*, and that is of *Prateolus*, who ſpeaking of the ſame *Peter de Bruis*, ſays, † " He aſſerted that Baptiſm " was uſeleſs to Children, who wanted the Ex- " erciſe of Reaſon, becauſe Infants, who want " the Uſe of Reaſon, can't have Faith, ſo as " to believe the Word of God when preach'd " to 'em, which he aſſerted to be abſolutely ne- " ceſſary to every one who ſubmitted to Bap- " tiſm; ſo that if any one ſhould be baptiz'd " without previous Faith, he ſaid his Baptiſm " would be of no Uſe to him. This Author

---

* Quæ Hæreſis prima Infantium Baptiſmum apertè damnavit, & adultis tantum convenire, & verbis docendo, & re ipſâ baptizando, pernaciter aſſeruit. Georg. Caſſand. in Præf. lib. de Bapt. Inf. Apud Stenn. p. 83.

† Aſſerebat autem hic Parvulis uſu rationis carentibus non prodeſſe Baptiſma, quod Parvuli qui ſunt rationis expertes, fidem habere nequeant, nec Dei verbo, quod illis prædicatum fuit, credere hoc autem aſſeverabat ſummè fore neceſſarium cuicunque Baptiſma ſuſcipienti: adeo ſane ut ſi quis ſine prævia fide Baptiſma ſuſcepiſſet, nihil ei prodeſſe Baptiſma diceret. *Prateol.* Hæreſ. L. 14. cap. 18. & L. 8. c. 7. *Apud Stenn.* p. 83, 84.

charges the ſame Opinion on *Henricus* the Diſciple of *Peter de Bruis.*

Mr. *Stennett* has immediately ſubjoined this Obſervation, *viz. That theſe Perſons lived in the 12th Century after Chriſt*, &c.

It may not be improper now to return, and to ſhew how theſe *brave People* (the *Waldenſes)* diſſeminated their *Principles*, and maintained their Religion, thro' unheard of Cruelties which they chearfully underwent for Conſcience Sake; and they became the more famous by the Acceſſion of the Diſciples of *Peter Waldo*, who agreed very much in their Opinions with the more antient *Subalpini*, and the Inhabitants of the *Vatleys of Piedmont*. I have already obſerved from Dr. *Allix*, that this Acceſſion of Numbers gave a Handle to ſome popiſh Writers and others, to repreſent them as the very ſame People; and indeed the Similitude of their Name, as well as their Religion, gave ſomething of a fair Colour to this Pretence; whereas, in Reality, the *Vallenſes* exiſted long before the *Valdenſes* or *Waldenſes*, if ancient Records may be depended upon. However, it pleaſed God eminently to bleſs *Waldo* and his Followers, and to ſpirit them up to ſtand as faithful Witneſſes to very important Truths, in Oppoſition to the ſcandalous Corruptions of thoſe ignorant and licentious Times. Mr. *Brandt*, ſpeaking of *Waldo*, ſays, "* The Succeſs

* Brandt's Hiſt. Ref. Vol. I. B. I. p. 12.

he

" he met with, and the Number of his Fol-
" lowers were ſo great in a ſmall Space of Time,
" that the Clergy pronounced him a Heretick,
" and raiſed ſuch a Perſecution againſt thoſe of
" his Perſuaſion, as diſpers'd them into ſeveral
" Parts of *Europe*, and even filled the *Nether-*
" *lands* (whither he himſelf alſo fled) with Re-
" fugees. They were not only ſtiled *Wal-*
" *denſes* (or *Vaudois*) from their Leader, but
" likewiſe the *Poor of Lyons*, or *Leoniſts*, *Albi-*
" *genſes*, *Angennenſers*, *Toulouſers*, *Bulgarians*,
" *Picards*, *Weavers*, *Perfectiſts*, *Humeliſts*, *In-*
" *ſabbatates*, *Cathari*, or *Gazariſts*, *Chienards*,
" or *Caignards*, *Freſons*, *Dulans*, *Lollards*, *Tur-*
" *lupines*, *Paterines*, *Piphles*, *Popelicans*, *Pub-*
" *licans*, *Paſſagins*, *Petrobruſians*, *Henricians*,
" *Joſephines*, *Arnaldiſts*; and afterwards alſo,
" *Fratres Bohemi*, and *Huſſites*: All which *Ap-*
" *pellations* were beſtowed on them, either from
" the Country or Place where their Opinions
" prevailed, or from ſome Crimes of which
" they were accuſed; or laſtly, from ſome Body
" or other that had profeſs'd the ſame Prin-
" ciples, either before or after *Waldo*; for
" ſome think it very certain, that *Waldo* him-
" ſelf learned theſe Doctrines firſt from ſome
" of the People inhabiting the mountainous
" *Frontiers* of *Erance*, &c."

'Tis very natural to judge from theſe Expreſſions, that the Author intended the Frontiers of *France* bordering upon *Italy*, and looking towards *Savoy*. So that according to this Account, *Peter Waldo* is repreſented as having

as having derived his Religion from the Inhabitants of the *Valleys* of *Piedmont*. What I obſerve further, is, that they were called *Fratres Bohemi* and *Huſſites*, which ſhews that their Religion was introduced amongſt the ancient *Bohemians*. I have already hinted that Dr. *Allix* allows this, and that there were ſome of them who made light of *Infant-Baptiſm*. I ſhall only add a ſhort Paſſage or two from him to this Purpoſe. His Words are theſe, " * The " ſame Inquiſitor whoſe Extract I have but " now given, gives us an Account of the Manner how the *Bohemians*, who were a Colony " of the *Waldenſes* managed their Controverſies " with the Church of *Rome*, &c. In another Place he ſays thus, " Now becauſe the *Waldenſes* being driven into *Bohemia*, have con- " tinued there ſeveral Years, it is but reaſon- " able for us, with ſome Attention to take a " View of the State of thoſe Churches; this, " as on the one Hand, it will give us a juſt " Idea of the Purity of that Spring, from " whence this Rivulet was ſupplied with Wa- " ter, *&c.* And a little lower, he mentions one of their Errors as charged upon them by the aforeſaid Inquiſitor, *viz.* " Concerning the " Sacrament of Baptiſm, they ſay, that the " Catechiſm ſignifies nothing; that the Abſolu- " tion pronounced over Infants ſignifies nothing; " that the Godfathers and Godmothers do not " underſtand what they anſwer the Prieſt.

* Dr. *Allix*, ibid. p. 211, 214, 221.

I ſhall

I ſhall conclude the Citations of this Nature with a judicious Obſervation of the late Reverend Mr. *Benjamin Stinton*, on an Extract of a Letter preſerv'd by *Colomeſius*, but wtitten to *Eraſmus* out of *Bohemia*, dated *October* 10. 1519, in which an Account is given of a Sect then in being, and which had been in that Country for above 90 Yeers. The Letter deſcribes 'em, among other Things to have acted thus, " † Such as come over to their Sect, muſt " every one be baptiz'd anew in mere Water; " they make no bleſſing of Salt, nor of the " Water, nor make any Uſe of conſecrated " Oil." Upon which Mr. *Stinton* makes this Remark, *That this Deſcription does almoſt in every Thing fit the* Modern Anabaptiſts, *eſpecially thoſe in* England, *and gives them a better Right, than any other Proteſtants, to claim theſe People for their Predeceſſors.*

Now let any one impartially examine theſe Accounts, and conſider the Evidences offered from *Gundulphus*'s Time, in the Year 1025, to *Eraſmus*'s Days 1519, and the Appearance of *Fælix Mans* in 1522, and the Witneſſes ſucceeding one another, and who ſeemed to be no Favourers of Infant-baptiſm, will fill up the Space of near 500 Years before the Reformation obtained by *Luther* and *Calvin*. I may add to this Conſideration, that the *Baptiſteries* in the Manner deſcribed already, to *dip* the *Catechumens*

† *Colomeſius*'s Collection of Letters of Men of Note, *Ep.* 30, Mr. *Stinton*'s MS. before me.

in

in their Baptiſm, ſubſiſted till the *Sixth Century*; and if the intercurring Centuries between the ſixth and the tenth Age, were almoſt buried in the Obſcurity of the Ignorance and Barbariſm of thoſe Times, 'twas no *new Thing* that befel the *Church of God*. Did not *Moſes* ſee the Buſh all on Fire, and yet it was not conſumed?

Did not the Prophet *Elijah* complain that the Body of the *Jewiſh* Church had forſaken God's Covenant, and that he was left *alone* to witneſs for him? but the Lord anſwered that he had a ſecret Reſerve of *Seven Thouſand in Iſrael, all the Knees which had not bowed unto Baal.* There is ſome good Ground to believe that it was thus, in regard to *Goſpel-Baptiſm*, even in the *darkeſt Ages of Chriſtianity.*

But I muſt return to take ſome Notice of what Mr. *W.* has aſſerted, *p.* 60. *viz.* that the pernicious Principles of *Nicholas Stock* (the Man's Name was *Stork*) and *Thomas Muncer maintained by them and their Followers, occaſion'd moſt of thoſe grievous Troubles this Nation felt, in the Times of the late Uſurper* Oliver Cromwell. The Principles he tells us, *were ſuch as Community of Goods, Multiplicity of Wives, the Lawfulneſs of propagating their Doctrine by the Sword, and that pernicious Principle of Dominion's being founded in Grace.* Here I deſire to know, in whom theſe Principles appeared? There were no *Germans* of this Sort that came over hither to act under *Oliver Cromwell*; the *Munſterian Faction* both of *Baptiſts* and *Pædobabtiſts*

baptiſts had been dead and buried above an hundred Years before this Time.

There were no *Britiſh Baptiſts*, that ever entertained, or acted according to theſe Principles. *Bailie*'s malicious Account, with Mr. *W*'s Comment upon it, will never go down with any, unleſs they be ſome ignorant People, who greedily ſwallow any Thing that an ill-natured Writer thinks fit to vent againſt the poor Baptiſts. But if Mr. *W.* has a Mind to enter into the Detail of theſe Things, I can eaſily ſhew what occaſional Share the *Baptiſts* bore in the Troubles of the late Times, and make it appear to the World, that they were Pædobaptiſts who begun and ended the *Civil War*, let the Charge fall upon what Denomination it will. Mr. *W.* may endeavour to ſalve Things as he pleaſes, and as he does in the *Gloceſter*-Journal, but there is no good-will intended in this and other Paragraphs, towards the *Baptiſts* in *England* and *Wales*, againſt whom he writes. The People of our Perſuaſion have always expreſſed their juſt Abhorence of ſuch Crimes, whether in *Foreigners* or *Natives*; and there was no more Reaſon for Mr. *W.* to revive this *German Story* at this Time a Day, than there is for another to make the ſcandalous Lives of common *Malefactors*, the natural Conſequence of *Pædobaptiſm*; which if any one ſhould be ſo weak and wicked as to attempt to do, I ſhould think no Puniſhment too ſevere to be inflicted on him: But becauſe the foreign Anabaptiſts have been generally involved in the common

mon Calumnies, and reckoned by the *Engliſh Vulgar* to be a baſe Set of People, 'tis but reaſonable that I ſhould ſuggeſt a few Thoughts in their Favour, if it were only to do their Memories common Juſtice.

I would then in this Place briefly obſerve theſe following Things. 1. That their Hiſtory has been tranſmitted down to us, through the Hands of their Enemies, who would be ſure to aggravate Things, and to ſet 'em off in the moſt diſagreeable Colours. 2. That there are Things ſaid of them not only improbable but contradictory in their own Natures, as when our *Engliſh* Writers repreſent them as having ſet all *Germany* on a Flame, and as if they had been ſtrong enough to overſet the *Roman* Empire; at other Times they treat 'em as a ſmall contemptible Handful of Men. 3. 'Tis certain from ſome of the beſt Hiſtorians of that Age, that the innocent often ſuffered with the guilty. I need only take Notice of one Paſſage in Mr. *Brandt*, to verify what I now affirm, where he is ſpeaking of the Executions after the *Munſterian Enthuſiaſm*, and other mad Frolicks of the *Anabaptiſts*; he ſays, " Thus " in the apprehending and condemning the " People of this Sect, there was little Notice " taken, whether thoſe whom they put to " Death, were in any wiſe guilty of the a- " bovementioned Riots and Mutinies: But the " Severity of the Government was extended a- " gainſt all of them, without making any Diſ- " tinction hardly between the moſt ſimple and

" innocent

" innocent, and the moſt Criminal. Thus the " *Hiſtory of the Anabaptiſt Martyrs* relates, " that they beheaded at *Amſterdam* one *Peter* " a Sexton of *Sardam*, as guilty of the late " Inſurrection, tho' he being a *Teacher* among " a better Sort of *Anabaptiſts*, had uſed his ut- " moſt Endeavours to hinder it.

4. Some of the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians* were as bitter Enemies to them, as any of the *Blood-thirſty Inquiſitors themſelves*, And that good temper'd Gentleman *Eraſmus*, tho' a *Papiſt*, and only a By-ſtander, yet had great Compaſſion on them, and uſed his Intereſt in writing very movingly in their Favour. Thus Mr. *Brandt* informs us, " * That he was particu- " larly ſcandalized at the Perſecutions which " the *Zuinglians* raiſed againſt the *Anabaptiſts*; " for it was about the Time that thoſe of " *Zurich* had ordained by a ſecond Decree, " *That the Anabaptiſts ſhould be no where to-* " *lerated within their Canton; but taken up in* " *order to be brought to capital Puniſhment.* " They inſiſt and argue, *ſays he*, that Hereticks " ought not to be puniſhed with Death; where- " as they themſelves inflict the ſame upon the " *Anabaptiſts*, a People againſt whom there is " very little to be ſaid, and concerning whom, " we are aſſured, there are many who have

---

* This Letter was written to thoſe of the *Low Countries* and *Eaſt Frieſland*, about 1530. *Vide Brandt*, Vol. I. B. 11. p. 58.

" been

" been reformed from the worſt to the beſt " Lives: And tho' perhaps they may fooliſhly " err in certain Opinions, yet have they neve. " ſtorm'd *Towns* nor *Churches*, nor entered into " any Combinations againſt Authority of the " Magiſtrate, nor driven any Body from his " Government or Eſtate. He farther relates, " how the *Reformed* endeavoured to force Men " to their Perſwaſion.

My Deſign is not to extenuate the Crimes of any who were *really* guilty, but to ſhew, that the *main Body* of theſe *Foreign Anabaptiſts* were truly religious, and *Men of another Spirit*; and tho' there were ſome among thoſe who went under that Denomination, who might juſtly be term'd *fooliſh* and *enthuſiaſtick* or *vile* and *licentious*; yet the Communities of this Perſwaſion (called *Anabaptiſts*) ſhew'd as much pious Zeal againſt *Popery*, and as much Seriouſneſs and Sobriety, in moral and Chriſtian Converſation, as any other Parties of *Proteſtants* whatſoever. And when they were called to ſuffer for the Truth, none were more ready to ſeal it with their Blood. None embrac'd the Stake with greater Alacrity. None underwent the moſt cruel Torments with more invincible Patience and *Chriſtian* Fortitude of Mind.

Inſomuch that Cardinal *Hoſius*, one of the *Pope*'s *Preſidents* at the *Council of Trent*, ſaid thus of them, " * If the Truth of Religion

* Annot. on *Brandt*'s third Book of Vol. I.

were

"were to be judg'd of, by the readineſs and "chearfulneſs which a Man of any Sect ſhows in "ſuffering, then the Opinion and Perſwaſion "of no Sect can be truer or ſurer than that of the "*Anapaptiſts:* ſince there have been none for "theſe twelve hundert Years paſt, that have "been more grievouſly puniſh'd, or that have "more chearfully and ſtedfaſtly undergone, and "even offer'd themſelves to the moſt cruel ſorts "of Puniſhments, than theſe People." My plain Intention therefore is, to lay before the honeſt Reader ſome few Inſtances, (for I have not Room to add many) of the Simplicity and faithfulneſs of theſe People in Reſigning themſelves to *Martyrdom* for the Principles they profeſs'd. This perhaps may not only be a little Entertaining, but be a means to convince the common ſort among us, that they did not deſerve to be branded with that *Odium* which Foreign *Anapaptiſts* are uſually loaded with in our *Engliſh Writings.*

I ſhall accordingly tranſcribe theſe following Exemples out of that excellent Hiſtorian ſo often mention'd M^r. *Gerard Brandt*, who himſelf was a *Pædobaptiſt.*

I.

"In the Year 1549. there lay in Priſon at *Am-*"*ſterdam*, on Account of Religion, about twen-"ty *Anapaptiſts*, of whom all but five Men and "three Women made their Eſcape by the help "of ſome Friends: and a certain Taylor named "*Ellert Janſon* might have ſaved himſelf with "the reſt of his Companions, but the refus'd it,

"ſaying:

" ſaying; *I am now ſo well ſatisfied to be offer'd*
" *up, and feel my ſelf at preſent in ſuch a*
" *State of Salvation, that if I ſhould live longer*
" *I do not expect to be better.* He was lame of
" one Leg, and thought that tho' he might
" get out, he ſhould be eaſily diſcover'd and
" taken; he therefore ſtaid behind, and was
" burnt on the twentieth of *March*, with the
" other five Men and three Women, *for that*
" *they* (for ſo run the Sentence) *had ſuffer'd*
" *themſelves to be rebaptiz'd.* —— *and had*
" *wrong Notions of the Sacraments.* As he was
" leading to Execution, he cried out, *This is*
" *the moſt joyful Day of my whole Life.*

II.

About the ſame Time, two Men of the ſame Sect were put to Death at *Leeuwarden*, as alſo a Woman drown'd, after having been firſt tortur'd with *Thumb-Irons*, and *Shan-Screws*, as they call them. The Reaſon of treating her thus in particular was, that having found a *Latsn Teſtament* in her Houſe, they thought She was a Teacher, and that *Menno* (a Miniſter's Name) was her Huſband; and were therefore reſolv'd to know whom She had taught, and who were her Accomplices, or preſent when She baptiz'd. She would not anſwer to any of theſe Queſtions, but ſaid; *Examine me as to my Faith, and I will readily anſwer you.* For a Trial of her Opinions about the *Hoſt*, ſhe was aſked, what were the Expreſſions of our Saviour, when he gave his Diſciples the Sacrament? to which She replied, *What did he give them*

Fleſh

Fleſh or Bread? They anſwered, he gave them Bread, Then ſaid ſhe, *Did not the Lord remain among them, who then could eat his Fleſh?* The Judges ask'd her further, whether ſhe believed their Children to be damn'd, becauſe they were baptized? To which ſhe replied, *no, that be far from me, that I ſhould condemn Children.* Then ſaid ſome Body to her, don't you expect to be ſaved by Baptiſm? She anſwered, *no; all the Water in the Sea cannot ſave me, nor any Thing elſe but the Salvation which is in Chriſt, who has commanded me to love the Lord my God above all Things, and my Neighbour as my ſelf.*

III.

In the Year 1551, there were Sixteen *Anabaptiſts*, of whom Five were Women, put to Death for Religion. Two of the Men, together with the two Women, being condemned at *Gaunt*, thanked their Judges for ſentencing them to be burnt. Yea, one of the Women cried out to 'em, *My Lords! You may ſave three of your Stakes, we can die all four of us at one, ſince we are but one in a ſpiritual Senſe.* One of the Men broke out into theſe Words, when upon the Scaffold, *O ye Inhabitants of* Gaunt! *we do not die like Hereticks or Lutherans, who hold a Cann of Beer in one Hand, and a Bible in the other, and ſo diſhonour the Word of God with Drunkenneſs; but we die for the real Truth.* In the Number of thoſe that were murdered, was *Jerom Segerts*, with his Wife, and others:

Theſe ſuffered at *Antwerp*. When the Judges gave him ſome Hopes of ſaving his Life, provided he would be converted to the *Romiſh Church*, *Jerom* anſwered them thus: *Though you ſhould ſet the Door of the Priſon open, and ſhould ſay to me, go; only, cry, you are ſorry; I would not ſtir, becauſe I know I have the Truth of my Side.* Whilſt he was in the Dungeon, he writ to his Wife in the following Manner: *I find the Lord is with us. We have a Treaſure in earthly Veſſels. This will not be hid. One calls out to the other, and pours out his Treaſure, ſo that it may be ſeen. We call, we ſing* (Pſalms) *to each other, we have the like Joy in comforting one another; the Lord has granted us ſuch a Mixture of Strength and Confidence, that we cannot ſufficiently thank him, for the great Mercies we have received from him.* And again, in another Letter, *I have ſo much Comfort thro' God's Promiſes, that I do not ſo much as think upon my Sufferings. I feel ſo much Joy and Pleaſure, that I can neither expreſs it by Speech nor Writing. I did not imagine, that a Man could be ſenſible of ſo much Gladneſs in a Priſon: it is ſo great, that it will hardly ſuffer me to ſleep Day or Night. I can ſcarce think I have lain here more than one Day. Oh! that I could break my Heart in Pieces, and diſtribute it between you, and the reſt of my Friends. Oh! that I could ſerve you and them with my Blood.* He was burnt the 2d of *September*. They ſtaid till his Wife was delivered

of

of her Child, and then they threw her one Morning early, into the *Scheld* (a River)

IV.

During this Perſecution, but we can't fix the exact Time, there was brought before the *bloody Tribunal*, a Man, 75 Years old; his Hair was white, his Body lean with Age, his Manners irreproachable, ſuch as naturally ſpring from a Heart poſſeſs'd with the true Fear of God. This Man had been baptized, or rather rebaptized by the *Brethren* in his old Age. Whilſt he ſat bound like an innocent Sheep for the Slaughter-houſe, encompaſſed by a Number of *Burghers*, waiting for the *Criminal Magiſtrate*, who was to pronounce Sentence of Death againſt him, one of the *Officers* ſpake thus to him, in the Hearing of the People: *Good Father*, Why do you continue thus obſtinately in your curſed Error: Do you think there is no ſuch Place as Hell? *Sir*, ſaid the old Man, *I believe a Hell moſt certainly, but I know nothing of the Errors you mention:* Yet, ſaid another, you are in an Error, and ſo dreadful a one, that if you die in it, you will be damned for ever. *Are you ſure of that?* ſaid the old Man again; yes replied the *Officer*, it is as ſure as any Thing in the World; thinking he had ſtaggered him, and hoping for the Honour of his Converſion. But the old Man returned him a very unexpected Anſwer: *If it be ſo*, ſaid he, *then are ye Murderers of my Soul.* Upon this there was a very great Silence among the Multitude, who were

very attentive to this Diſcourſe of the old Man; at which the *Officer*, half aſhamed, and not a little enraged, cried aloud to the Priſoner, *What do you ſay, you impudent Fellow? Are we the Murderers of your Soul?* The old Man anſwered, *Do not be angry, Sir, at the Sound of Truth; you your ſelf know, that Faith is the Gift of God; that neither I, nor any other, can extort this ſaving Gift out of God's Hand; that God beſtows his Gifts on one Man early, on another late, juſt as he called the Husbandmen into the Vineyard. Suppoſe now, that I had not yet received this Gift, as you have; ought you to puniſh me for that Misfortune? Might not God, in caſe you ſuffered me to live, might he not impart to me, as well as to you, this wholeſome Gift in a Week, a Month, a Year? If then you hinder me from ſharing therein, by depriving me of this Time of Grace, what are you otherwiſe than Murderers of my Soul?* Theſe plain but ſtrong Arguments, couragiouſly urg'd by this good old Man, did ſo move the Hearts of the Towns People that ſtood about him, that there was no ſmall Murmuring among them.

V.

When the Perſecution was at the hotteſt in *Amſterdam*, a certain Man (*Anabaptiſt*) being informed, that one of his Sect was to be burnt there at ſuch a Time, he made all the Haſte he could from *Waterland*, but arriv'd too late, that the *Boom* next the *Y* (a Paſſage) was ſhut; but with the Help of Money he got that open'd:

and

and running to the *Dam* as fast as he could, he placed himself upon an *Eminence*. And when he saw the Prisoner ascending the Scaffold, cried out to him, *Brother, fight manfully*. At this Cry, Endeavours were used to seize him, but they laid Hands on the wrong Person, who trembling, begun to justify himself. This brought the true Man to light, who, to save the innocent, came forth, saying, *I am the Man*. Upon which Confession, he was committed, tried, condemned and executed, in the Space of 14 Days.

VI.

In the Year 1553, of the 6th of *January*, two others were executed; one was a Man of *Sollem*, the other was a Women of *Freden*; who, when she was brought to the Rack, confessed, that she had harboured several of her own Sect, and brought over others to her Opinions. She behav'd so modestly and handsomely in her Bonds, and by a long Imprisoment, was become so familiar with the Keeper's Wife, that she employed her about the House like a Servant. And one Day, when some Dirt was to be carried out of the House, and there was no Body else to do it, she offered her Service; but the Mistress asked her, *If she would not take the Opportunity to run away?* The young Woman assured her she should not; but afterwards reflecting on human Frailty, she refused to expose herself to such a Temptation, and staid. Soon after she went to the Scaffold and the Fire, dressed

dreſſed in her beſt Apparel, as if ſhe had gone to be married.

VII.

At *Dixmude*, in *Flanders*, one *Walter Capel* was brought into Trouble on the ſame Account, (Anabaptiſm) He was a very generous Man, and bountiful to the Poor; among whom, he had often fed a poor ſimple Creature that was maintain'd by the Alms of the *Town*, and paſſed for a Changeling. When he was condemned to die, this Fool cried out to the *Judges*, *Ye Murderers, ye ſpill innocent Blood: the Man has done no ill, but always gave me Bread.* And whilſt *Capel* was at the Stake, he would have thrown himſelf into the Fire, if he had not been hindered. Nor did his Gratitude die with his *Patron*, for he went daily to the Gallows-field, where the half-burnt Carcaſe was faſten'd to a Stake, and there he ſtroked the Fleſh of the dead Man with his Hand, ſaying, *Ah! poor Creature, you did no Harm, and yet they have ſpilt your Blood. You gave me my Belly-full of Victuals.* And ſometime after, when the Fleſh was all conſumed, he went again to the Stake, pulled away the Bones, and laying them upon his Shoulders, carried them to the Houſe of one of the *Burgomaſters*, with whom, as it happened, ſeveral others of the *Magiſtracy* were then preſent; and caſting the ſaid Bones at their Feet, cried out in a *ſnarling Tone*, there, *you Murderers, you have firſt eaten his Fleſh, eat now his Bones.*

VIII. A

VIII.

A certain Tradeſman, who kept a Stall in the Market-place at *Bergen-op-zoom*, being an *Anabaptiſt*, refuſed to kneel to the *Sacramental* Bread, as it was carried before his Shop; for which only he was taken up, impriſon'd, condemned to Death, and burnt without the Town. His wonderful Conſtancy and Courage in ſuffering, made ſuch an Impreſſion upon the *Droſſart*, or *Lord* of the Place, who had cauſed him to be proſecuted, and had ſeen his End, that aſſoon as he had returned home, thro' Sorrow and Concern, he fell into a violent Fit of Sickneſs both of Body and Mind: During which, he did nothing but cry out, Oh *Simon!* (this was the Name of the Man that was murdered) the *Monks* endeavoured to pacify and comfort him, but all in vain. And accordingly he died ſoon after in a deſpairing Condition.

IX.

1558. In this Year about forty *Anabaptiſts* fell by the Hand of the Executioner,——— among thoſe that were put to Death at *Courtray*, was *Daniel Verkampt*; who had been harboured by his Mother, a very ancient Woman. The *Dean* of *Rouſen*, Inquiſitor of *Flanders*, who had examined the Son about his Religion, ſummon'd his Mother alſo to appear before him. She was told, *That for harbouring her Son, a Heretick, ſhe had forfeited her Life and Eſtate, according to the Placard of the Emperor.*

ror. To this the poor old Creature thus replied; *My Lords, am I to forfeit Life and Eſtate for harbouring my own Son, whom I bore in my Womb, and brought forth with Pain, and educated with great Trouble and Charge; who is neither Rogue nor Thief, but was counted the moſt honeſt, hopeful young Man in our Village, only becauſe you ſay he is a Heretick? If the Emperor, whoſe Laws you pretend to obſerve, were here preſent, I believe he would ſay, that they are miſapplied, and commend my motherly Affection. Indeed my Lords, you do not act as you ought. If I could have conceiv'd this my Son again, at the Inſtant you ſent to ſeize him, have hid him from you in my Womb, and have carried him there nine Months, and afterwards have endured the ſame Pain and Trouble in bearing and bringing him up, as I had done before; God knows, and you ought alſo to know, how freely I would have undergone it.* This her maternal Eloquence ſo moved the Judges, that they immediately diſcharged her, but would not be intreated for her Son.

X.

The *Anabaptiſt* who was put to Death at *Dort* at this Time, had been a *Burgomaſter* at *Menin*, and was fled thither on the Account of the Perſecution. It is thought that his Death cauſed ſome Remorſe in his very Judges. Being either ſuſpected or diſcovered, he had been ſummoned by the Magiſtrates to attend them in the great Church, with Intention, that he ſhould look

look upon ſuch a Summons as a Warning, and ſo make the beſt of his Way. But, his Simplicity, and the Advice of ſome of his Friends, who too much relied upon the Magiſtrates, prevail'd upon him to appear, where, when he came, he was ſecur'd.

While he was under Confinement, they carried him before the Court of *Holland*, in order to be diſcharged of him; but that Court enquired into the Buſineſs, and ſent him back to *Dort*, where, after many Delays, they were forced to paſs Sentence of Death upon him; the ſaid Sentence being ſhort and remarkable, we thought proper to inſert it here, Word for Word, as follows Whereas *George Wippe* (for that was his Name) born at *Menin*, in *Flanders*, *has preſumed to be rebaptized, and has entertained ill Opinions, according to the Evidence that has been given againſt him before the Magiſtrates, and his own Confeſſion, he is therefore condemned, to the Honour of God, and for an Example to the Publick, to be drown'd in a Barrel, and after that his Body is to be carried to the Place of common Execution, and there faſtened to the Gallows, and his Eſtate forfeited, and to be brought into the Town's Treaſury. Done and declared the 4th of* Auguſt, *in the Year* 1558.

And what is ſtill more remarkable, the Hangman, who was to perform this Sentence, refuſed to do it, ſaying, that he would rather lay down his Office, than be guilty of the Death of ſo good a Man; by whoſe Bounty the Mouths of his Wife and Children had been often fed and filled

filled; who had often done good to him and others, and never done Wrong to any. Thereupon he was remanded back to Priſon, where he continued ſeven Weeks longer, till at laſt they cauſed him to be drown'd privately, and in the Night, by another Hand.

XI.

1559. The Number of *Anabaptiſts*, who loſt their Lives this Year, on account of their Religion, amounted to about 40 Perſons; ſome were examined concerning their Faith by the *Inquiſitors*, and particularly by the Dean of *Rouſen*, who for his Zeal was nicknam'd *Saul*. It is related of this *Inquiſitor*, that his Manner was to go about the Town, attended only with a couple of Servants, to ſearch for ſuſpected People, eſpecially for *Anabaptiſts*, and to take them up; and that being met one Time by the *Red Rod*, an Officer of Juſtice ſo called, and ask'd how he durſt venture ſo ſlenderly attended, to apprehend thoſe *Hereticks*; whereas I can't exerciſe my Office, ſaid he, but at the Peril of my Life, tho' attended by a great many Servants, and all of us well armed?

The Dean replied, I have nothing to fear; for my Buſineſs is only to take good People, who bear no Arms, nor make any Reſiſtance. *Then ſaid the Red Rod*, If this be the Caſe, that you are to take all the *good Men*, and I the *bad*, we ſhall ſtock the Priſons bravely between us.

About this Time, one *John*, a Glazier, who was impriſoned, and condemn'd to die upon Accou[illegible]

Account of his Religion, writ a Letter to his Wife, out of which what I am relating is an Extract, and repreſented to her the Duty of a Widow, and how God, the Husband of Widows, ſupports and provides for them; for which Reaſon he recommended her and her Children to the Providence of the Almighty; at the ſame Time declaring, that his Faith was ſo well ſettled, that he would not depart from one ſingle Article of it, tho' his *Perſecutors* ſhould quarter him for it. *Yea, tho' they ſhould ſet open the Priſon-door* (theſe are his Words) *and ſay to me, Get you home, we will ſay you have recanted, only do you hold your Peace; I would rather die, than be guilty of this Diſſimulation.*

XII.

1563. At *Halwiin* alſo in *Flanders*, ſeveral *Anabaptiſts*, who had been betrayed by the *Paſtor* of that Town, were apprehended by the Dean of *Rouſen*, and carried away to *Liſle*; among thoſe was *John Deſwarte*, a Miniſter, with his Wife and four Sons. The two youngeſt of his Children not being at home when the *Inquiſitor* broke into the Houſe, were warn'd by the Neighbours to eſcape; but one of them ſaid to the other, *Let us not ſeek to ſave our ſelves, but rather die with our Father and Mother.* In the mean Time they carried the Father out, who ſeeing his Sons, ſaid thus to 'em, *Will ye go alſo to the New Jeruſalem?* One of them who was ſcarce Sixteen, cried, *Yes, we will,*

will, Father: and ſo they ſurrendred themſelves. Together with them, two other Perſons of the ſame Perſuaſion, who happened to be in the Houſe, were likewiſe ſeized, as alſo two married Couples, and one ſingle Woman; all which, (except one Woman that recanted) and a Man that called out to them and comforted them, were at ſeveral Times burnt at *Liſle.*

But I have already exceeded the Bounds I at firſt propoſed to my ſelf; now theſe ſhort *Memoirs*, which I have faithfully tranſcrib'd, are out of Mr. *Brandt*'s firſt Volume of the Reformation: where, any one may ſee a great many more Inſtances to this Purpoſe. For I have carefully told over Five hundred and Seventy odd Perſons (*all Anabaptiſts)* who were put to Death, merely on Account of Religion; excluſive of, and in Contradiſtinction to, any who ſuffered as chargeable with Treaſon, Rebellion, Sedition, *&c.* nor have I reckoned into the Number, a *whole Aſſembly* of theſe People, which was betrayed at *Rotterdam* in the Year 1544; for I could not make an Eſtimate of them: But all that were caught of theſe were executed. Upon a fair Computation then, this Scantling of *Anabaptiſts*, who ſuffered abroad, in and about the *Low Countries*, for their Religious Principles, amounts conſiderably to above the higheſt Number of thoſe, of whatſoever Denominations, who were put to Death

in

in *England*, on Account of the Reformation. What I further obſerve, is, that in the Judgment of *Chriſtian Charity*, there appeared in theſe, not only equal Firmneſs of Mind, and the Traces of a good Spirit, but they had ſuch divine Tranſports, and ſolid Aſſurances before their *Exits*, as eminently attended our *glorious Britiſh Martyrs*.

The CONCLUSION.

It now only remains, that for Form's Sake, I ſhould take Notice of the laſt Objection, as ſtated by Mr. *W.* which is this, *P.* 61. *We are often told, that Baptiſm is of no Uſe to Children, that they are not any Thing the better for being baptized.* To which he anſwers, that he hopes to make it appear, *That Baptiſm, if duly improv'd, is of real Service,* without *ſuppoſing it abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.* And to which I reply, that there being no Argument from this Place to the End of his Book, only Expoſtulations with, and ſome Hints of Inſtruction given to, *Pædobaptiſts*, I am no farther concern'd therein.

The End of the Anſwer to Mr. Fowler Walker.

ANIMADVERSIONS on the Reverend Dr. *Thomas Ridgley*'s Diſcourſe of *Infant-Baptiſm*, in his Second Volume of Divinity, publiſhed *Anno* 1733.

SINCE every private Member in a Community has an undoubted Right to judge, of what is offer'd to the Publick, there needs little or no Apology for this Undertaking. It may be ſufficient for me to aſſure any Gentlemen, to whom I may be an entire Stranger, that, 'tis not any inward Pleaſure I take in Religious Conteſts, nor any Secret Thirſt I have to engage in Diſputes with Men of diſtinguiſh'd Characters, that induc'd me to make the following Reflections: If the Reader would know the Motives, they are theſe. Having ſometime ago ſeen the Reverend Dr. *Thomas Ridgley*'s firſt Volume of Divinity, I was deſirous to peruſe the Second; and as I ſincerely

ſincerely profeſs a great Reſpect for that excellent Gentleman's Perſon, and heartily agree with him in the moſt important Truths of *Chriſtianity*, ſo I unfeignedly wiſh good Succeſs to his pious Labours both from the Pulpit and the Preſs, ſo far as I have Reaſon to eſteem 'em conſiſtent with the Scriptures of Truth. When I found in his ſecond Volume a Diſſertation on *Infant-Baptiſm*, I promiſed my ſelf a View, as in *Miniature*, of what might be ſaid upon that Subject, repreſented in the ſtrongeſt Light. The Author's known *Acumen* of Judgment, his great Acquaintance with Books, and conſummate Skill in the Controverſies of the Age, farther heighten'd my Expectation; nor am I diſappointed in the Peruſal: For I think, that this Learned Gentleman has ſuggeſted full as much as can be, and more than ought to be advanced, in Defence of that Practice. And having ſome Sheets of my own at that Time in the Preſs, upon the ſame Subject, in Anſwer to ſome Books diſpers'd in *Wales*, I thought it but juſt and reaſonable to conſider all the Arguments I could meet with in my Way. When I have ſaid this, I apply my ſelf without Loſs of Time to examine his Groundwork; for 'tis not any eaſy Matter to pitch upon a proper Foundation, whereupon to raiſe the Superſtructure of *Pædobaptiſm*. And 'tis eaſily obſerv'd, that the moſt learned Advocates of this Doctrine differ, in chuſing their *Medium*, and often change it, in their Debates upon this Head: and even at beſt, 'tis

but

but an accumulative Proof, (partly from uncertain Antiquity, and partly from remote Conſequences, and theſe artfully intermix'd or elaborately amaſs'd together) that is offer'd in Evidence in this Cauſe. But the learned Doctor has varied from a great many, and if I apprehend aright, he does not ſcruple to make *Natural* Religion the *Baſis*, upon which he would build *Infant-Baptiſm.* Accordingly, when he enters upon the Proof of this Point, he lays down this Preliminary, *viz. That it is the indiſpenſible Duty of Believers, to devote themſelves, and all they have, to God; which is founded in the Law of Nature, and is the Reſult of God's Right to us and ours*, p. 408. In few Lines further we are told, That, *this is in a particular Manner to be applied to our Infant-Seed, whom it is our Duty to devote to the Lord, as we receive them from him.* This looks like giving up all Claim to Revelation, as inſufficient to ſupport this Practice; and he confeſſes, that this Affair is not contained in ſo many expreſs Words in Scripture; and introduces the learned Dr. *Lightfoot*, as alſo owning the like Silence of the Scripture, as to this Matter, *p.* 413. Notwithſtanding theſe Conceſſions, he does not reſign circumſtantial, conſequential, and comparative Reaſonings and Evidences, as he thinks deducible from Revelation: So that 'tis upon this mix'd or aggregate Foundation he proceeds, and forms this Propoſition, *viz. That Baptiſm, in the general Idea thereof, is an Ordinance of Dedication or Conſecration of Per-*

ſons to God, p. 408. But being very ſenſible that a material Objection would follow this Propoſition cloſe upon the Heels, therefore he was obliged immediately to attempt the removing of it: The Reaſoning in this Paragraph ſeems to me to be ſomewhat involv'd, if not perplex'd: However, he informs us, that what he would more directly aſſert, in Anſwer to this Objection, is, *That Baptiſm is an Ordinance of Dedication, either of our ſelves or others; provided the Perſon who dedicates, has a Right to that which he devotes to God, and can do it by Faith.* Upon this Propoſition all the enſuing Deductions and Arguments depend, and upon this Baſis, the whole Streſs of Infants Right to Baptiſm, is laid. Part of my preſent Buſineſs ſeems to be, to examine whether *Pædobaptiſm*, according to this Propoſition, is not rather built upon Natural than Reveal'd Religion. And,

1. I readily allow that Baptiſm is an *Ordinance* in the common Acceptation of the Term, *i. e.* 'tis appointed of God.

2. I agree, that it is an Ordinance of Dedication, from the Nature and Manner of its Inſtitution: Hitherto we jointly proceed on the Foot of Revelation. But,

3. I abſolutely deny that 'tis an Ordinance of Dedication, *either of our ſelves or others*; here we take our Leave of plain Revela-

tion

tion, and launch out at once, upon the hazardous Bottom of either Fancy or pretended Reaſon. For, where has God given Intimation in any Part of his Revealed Will, that any one Man, has Authority to dedicate another (whether Infant or Adult) to him by Baptiſm? The Reverend Doctor is too well vers'd in the *Maxims* of *Theology*, and too nicely skill'd in the ſeverer Rules of *Logic* and *Ratiocination*, not to know, that from Natural Reaſon to inſtituted Worſhip, *Non valet Argumentum.* And if we take in the *Salvatory* Clauſe in the Words immediately following, *provided the Perſon who dedicates has a Right to that which he devotes to God*, yet this Doctrine, even with this *Proviſo*, cannot be defended: For a Maſter has an undoubted Natural Right to an Infant-Slave, which he has fairly purchas'd or procur'd; but the Queſtion is, whether he has a Right to devote him by Baptiſm to God? I do not ſuppoſe the worthy Doctor will avow this for Orthodoxy.

And yet I muſt own, he goes a great Length towards it, in this, and in the following Paragraph, where he ſays thus, *When I do, as it were, paſs over my Right to another, there is nothing requir'd in order hereunto, but that I can lawfully do it, conſidering it as my Property:* Here we have the Buſineſs of *Pædobaptiſm*

quite taken off, from any Dependency on Revelation, and plac'd upon the Foot of *Natural Right*. But whether the Argument will hold good in this Caſe, from *Natural Right* to *Fact*, I muſt leave for all judicious and impartial Readers to determine. Nor can I diſcern at preſent, according to the Doctor's own Propoſition, but that the Infant-Slave honeſtly purchaſed, may come in, as well as the Infant-Seed, for this Proxy-Dedication. I am ſure according to the Rules of Circumciſion, he has a Right, he ought to come in. If the Doctor thinks he has no Direction in Regard to the *Slave*, I would ask him, where has he any better Direction in Regard to the *Infant?* If he is afraid of Will-worſhip in the *one*, how will he get clear of it in the *other?* If it be natural Right without the Guidance of Revelation, that gives a Title to this Sort of Dedication, then he may certainly venture upon the *former* as well as the *latter*.

I chooſe to offer this, not only becauſe 'tis a parallel Caſe, but becauſe 'twas patroniz'd by St. *Auſtin* in the primitive Church. I ſhall only give a ſhort Paſſage out of the learn'd Mr. *Bingham*, and refer the Reader to ſee Things more at large, either in him or in St. *Auſtin*; whoſe Words are theſe, * *This Grace is ſometimes*

* Aliquando Filiis infidelium præſtatur hæc gratia ut baptizentur, cum occultâ Dei providentiâ in manus Priorum quomodocunque perveniunt. Aug. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit. Cap. 22. Tom. 7. p. 527.

Vi-

times vouchſafed to the Children of Infidels, that they are baptized, when by ſome Means thro' the ſecret Providence of God, they happen to come into the Hands of pious Chriſtians. " Some-
" times they were bought or redeem'd with Mo-
" ney, ſometimes made lawful Captives in War,
" and ſometimes taken up by charitable Perſons
" when they were expos'd by their Parents. In
" all which Caſes, either the Faith or Promi-
" ſes of the Sponſors, or the Faith of the Church
" in general, who was their common Mother,
" and whoſe Children they were now ſuppos'd
" to be, was ſufficient to give them a Title to
" Chriſtian Baptiſm."

And indeed I can't ſee, that there is any better Scripture-Warrant for dedicating Infant-Seed, than Infant-Slaves, in this Sort of Baptiſm.

But there is another reſtraining Clauſe in the learned Doctor's Propoſition, upon which, if I rightly judge he muſt lay conſiderable Streſs, *viz. That the Perſon who dedicates another by Baptiſm, muſt do it by Faith*, p. 409. And as to this, I would offer theſe following Conſiderations.

1. If he means true Faith, then there are but few Infants who are truly baptized: For none can have the Faith which is *of the Opera-*

Videas multos non offerri a parentibus, ſed etiam a quibuslibet Extraneis, ſicut a Dominis ſervuli aliquando offeruntur, &c. Ejuſd. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. apud Bingham. Orig. Eccl. Vol. I. p. 485.

tion of God, the Faith of God's Elect, but thoſe only who are God's peculiar People. So that upon the whole, there is not ſuch a wide Difference between the worthy Doctor's Judgment and ours, in this Caſe; we ſay, that no Infants at all ought to be baptized, and he will admit only thoſe of true Believers: If it be not true Faith which he intends, then all Infants have an equal Right to Baptiſm whoſe Parents are *Nominal Chriſtians*. And ſo this proviſional Clauſe comes to nothing.

2. True Faith was not requir'd, of old, in dedicating Infants to God by Circumciſion: the Infants of wicked and irreligious *Jews* had a Right to it, as the Seed of *Abraham*; nay, Infants born in his Houſe, of what Seed ſoever, were to partake of this Ordinance. And if true Faith be requir'd under this Diſpenſation, to dedicate by Baptiſm; then the Reverend *Aſſembly of Divines* and Dr. *Ridgley*, have curtail'd the Privileges of the Goſpel, and made 'em a great deal leſs, than thoſe of the Law; which is an Argument the *Pædobaptiſts* (the Doctor has not omitted it) are very fond of turning againſt the *Baptiſts*.

But I can't forbear wondering, that this learned Gentleman, ſhould lay himſelf ſo open as he does, in the enſuing Paragraph, *It follows from the laſt Head, that Parents who have a Right to their Infant-Seed, may devote them to God in Baptiſm, provided they can do it by Faith; and therefore a Profeſſion of Faith is only neceſſary in thoſe who are active, in this Ordinance,*

Ordinance, not in them that are merely paſſive. This we are obliged to maintain againſt thoſe who often intimate that Children are not to be baptiz'd, becauſe they are not capable of believing. The Reſult of this Way of Reaſoning is a fair Conceſſion, that the *Pædobaptiſts* are oblig'd to maintain a Doctrine which is not maintainable by Revelation: And the taking of this *Poſtulatum* for granted, is no other than downright begging of the Queſtion in Debate; which no Man will allow to be a legal Method of diſputing: And from this ſummary View of the worthy Doctor's Scheme and Way of proceeding, we may diſcern, that he does not pretend to build Infant-Baptiſm upon Scripture, but upon a certain Train of Deductions and Argumentations which cannot be made good from any clear Revelation. And yet the Point he contends for, is a *poſitive Inſtitution of the New Teſtament*, a Matter that depends ſolely on the Will of the Law-giver, and without whoſe Authority, we ought not to take one Step about it.

II. As to his ſecond Argument, which is this, *The Right of the Infant-Seed of Believers to Baptiſm, may be farther prov'd, from their being capable of the Privileges ſignified therein: and under an indiſpenſible Obligation to perform the Duties, which they, who dedicate them to God, make a publick Profeſſion of, as agreeable to the Deſign of this Ordinance.* p. 409.

There is nothing in this Poſition, nor in the Diſtinctions precedent and ſubſequent, that

ſhould hinder this Doctrine being applied, to an Infant-Slave fairly purchas'd: for the *Slave* when dedicated by his Maſter, in Baptiſm, is as capable every Way of the Priviledges of it, as the Infant-Seed of the ſaid Maſter; unleſs the Doctor will ſay, that the Infant-Seed is more ſuſceptive of Divine Grace, than the *Extraneous Slave.* And if he aſſerts this, it will effectually deſtroy the very Notion of ſovereign and free Grace in our Salvation. But I would ask, Was there not as much Reaſon to hope, that *Abraham* ſhould have religious Servants after they were circumciſed, as that his Seed in *Iſhmael* and *his Poſterity*, ſhould attain to the Privileges intended by Circumciſion? The Event ſhews that he had good Servants; witneſs that *Religious Man* train'd up in his Houſe, who was ſent to obtain *Rebekah* for *Iſaac.* But there is no great Reaſon to boaſt of any Goodneſs that appear'd in *Iſhmael*, or in his Poſterity.

Beſides, if Chriſtian Maſters would follow the Pattern of Circumciſion, which they all pretend to, (the Doctor among the reſt) they ſhould take their unbaptiz'd Servants and dedicate 'em by Baptiſm, as well as their Infant-Seed. For *Abraham* took all, *young* and *old*, and made them ſubmit to Circumciſion, as ſoon as ever he found that God had commanded it. If this be the Pattern after which we are to copy, why don't the *Pædobaptiſts* conform to it? If it be not the Pattern, then they muſt confeſs, that they go to work in the Dark, as their Fancy leads them, without any Divine Direction.

The

The Truth of it is, they are willing to retain of this Buſineſs of Circumciſion, as much as will ſerve their Turn at preſent, and leave all other Conſiderations belonging to it, as antiquated Uſages that may be caſt away at Pleaſure. Whereas if the Laws of Circumciſion are to be obſerv'd in Baptiſm, why are they not all religiouſly perform'd? if they are aboliſh'd, why are ſome of them reviv'd, and ſo zealouſly pleaded for? But if theſe Things were not abſolutely neceſſary to give ſome Countenance to a Practice, which is not ſo much as once mentioned in all the New Teſtament, the *Circumſtantials* of this abrogated Ceremony, would not be ſo much inſiſted upon.

III. His third Argument is taken from the Promiſe of God to *Abraham*. *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and to thy Seed after thee, to be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee*, p. 411.

I anſwer, that tho' I have ſaid already in the Third Chapter of this ſmall Treatiſe, more than I expect to be fairly anſwer'd upon the learned Doctor's Principles; however I ſhall add theſe Particulars.

1. That this Promiſe in the formal Manner it was made to *Abraham*, and in the Senſe which the *Pædobaptiſts* urge it, is never reſum'd in the New Teſtament. Or in plainer Words, God has no where promiſed to be the God of the *Natural Seed of Believers* under the Goſpel. He has promiſed to be *their God* and *their Father, and that they ſhould be his People, and*

and Sons and Daughters; but he has laid himſelf under no Engagement to take in a Succeſſion of their natural Seed. On the other hand, he has left himſelf at full Liberty, to call in whom he pleaſes. And when the Apoſtle, *Acts* 2. 39. made uſe of the Argument of the Promiſe of the Spirit, to preſs his Audience *to repent and be baptiz'd*, 'twas to the *Jews* directly, that he ſpoke; *the Promiſe is to you and to your Children*, or Poſterity: But when he turned his Thoughts to the *Gentiles*, the Language is chang'd, *To them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* 'Tis not ſaid, *To them that are afar off*, and to *their Children* or *Seed* in the *Stile* of the *Abrahamic Covenant*; but *to as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*; from *what Blood* or *Kindred* he pleaſes. This Doctrine is confirm'd throughout the New Teſtament; *God is no Reſpecter of Perſons, but in every Nation he that feareth him and worketh Righteouſneſs is accepted with him.* Acts 10 34, 35.

The Reverend Doctor, in the Sequel of his Reaſoning, makes uſe of a Method that deſerves more ſtrict Notice; for in ſpeaking of the Words already cited, *Acts* 2. 39. *And to them that are afar off, that is*, ſays he, *the Gentiles, who might claim this Promiſe when they believ'd, whom the Apoſtle calls elſewhere Children of the Promiſe as* Iſaac *was*, *p.* 411. Here I would obſerve.

1. That if the Doctor means, that Believers of the *Gentile* Race, may lay Claim to the Promiſe

miſe of the Holy Ghoſt, which is the *chief*, if not the *only* Promiſe ſpoken of in this Chapter, and intended here, I agree with him.

2. If he means that individual Believers among the *Gentiles*, are the *Children of the Promiſe*, according to *Gal.* 4. 28. which he cites in the *Margin*, I agree with him again, and ſo does the Scripture in general. But,

3. If he means that the natural Children deſcending from theſe *Gentile* Believers, are the *Children of the Promiſe*, to their reſpective Parents, as *Iſaac* was to *Abraham*, I utterly deny it, and 'tis groundleſs to affirm any ſuch Thing. And yet I cannot gueſs what he aims at, unleſs it be ſuch an unaccountable Thing as this. 'Tis not only unwarrantable, but ridiculous to pretend, that ordinary Infants in our Day, *are Children of the Promiſe*, to their ſeveral believing Parents, as *Iſaac* was to *Abraham*. Neither can I help taking the learned Doctor in this Senſe, from what he roundly declares in the Paragraph immediately following. *Theſe who are ſtiled before Converſion, a People afar off, were after it reckoned the ſpiritul Seed of* Abraham, *and ſo had a Right to the Bleſſings of the Covenant, that God would be a God to them; and by a Parity of Reaſon, in the ſame Senſe in which the Seed of* Abraham *were the Children of the Promiſe, the Seed of all other Believers are to be reckon'd ſo*, &c. Now I I can't conceive of any Senſe, in which this Propoſition may be ſaid to be true; there are divers Reſpects in which it will appear not to be ſo: for

for 'twas *Iſaac*, as given by Promiſe in an extraordinary Manner to *Abraham*, and as an eminent Type of *Chriſt*, and of all the *Elect* and true Believers in him, that gave Riſe to theſe Phraſes, *the Children of the Promiſe*, and the *promiſed Seed* ſo often mentioned in the Goſpel: and if none but the Elect of God, and true Believers, and theſe only, are called the Children of the Promiſe, in the Language and Senſe of the New Teſtament, and that the Infants of *Gentile* Believers, as ſuch, are never ſtiled nor reckon'd ſo; then the Doctor's Propoſition muſt be abſolutely falſe. What will further confirm that which I now inſiſt upon, is, that the unbelieving Deſcendants of *Abraham* thro' *Iſaac*, are expreſly ſaid, *not to be the Children of the Promiſe*, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. *For they are not all Iſrael, which are of Iſrael.*

Neither becauſe they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children: but in Iſaac ſhall thy Seed be called.

That is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God: but the Children of the Promiſe, are counted for the Seed.

Gal. 3. 29, *For if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe.*

Chap. 4. 28. *Now we Brethren, as Iſaac was, are the Children of the Promiſe.*

From theſe and other Places, I argue, that unbelieving *Jews*, tho' of *Iſaac*'s Lineage are not,

not, in the Language and Senſe of the Goſpel, called *the Children of the Promiſe.* And that only the *Elect of God* and *true Believers*, are ſtrictly ſo meant, and ſo called; and that the Infants of *Gentile* believing Parents never go under that Character, and 'tis an Abuſe of the Phraſe, and of the Import thereof, to ſtile them ſo.

'Tis added farther, that, *in the ſame Senſe in which the Seed of Abraham were Children of the Promiſe, the Seed of all other Believers are to be reckoned ſo, till by their own Act and Deed, they renounce this external Covenant-Relation*, p. 411. But it ſhould be firſt proved, that the Infants of believing Parents among the *Gentiles*, are in ſuch a Covenant-Relation to God, before we are formally told of their Renunciation of it. This is the Point before us. We abſolutely deny that there is any ſuch Thing under the Goſpel; and conſequently the advancing of this Doctrine is merely preſumptive and unſcriptural; 'tis calculated purely to maintain *Pædobaptiſm.* And what is ſuppoſed of theſe Infants, and indeed often comes to paſs, as they grow up, *viz.* their renouncing their Covenant-Relation, is, incompatible with the State of the *proper Children of the Promiſe.* And the Reverend Doctor knows and believes this: For the Scripture ſays, *The Foundation of God ſtandeth ſure*, &c. and again, *The Promiſe is ſure to all the Seed*, i. e. to every *Individual* of the *true Children of the Promiſe.* Therefore, I urge, that to attempt to uſher in, the

the natural Offspring of *Gentile* Believers, under the ſolemn Character of the *Children of the Promiſe*, is an unwarrantable Alienation of the Intent of thoſe Expreſſions, and againſt the Meaning and Spirit of the New Teſtament.

4. I obſerve that the Learned Doctor has taken a great Deal of ingenious Pains, to defend the celebrated Doctrine of *federal Holineſs*; and I return him my humble Thanks for ſo doing; for it having paſſed ſuch a Hand, I do not expect it ſhould be much mended by any other. And as I never could form any Conception of it under the New Teſtament, ſo I am now better ſatisfied than ever, that there is nothing in it. For he ſays, *That he does not intend, when he ſpeaks of the Infants of Believers, as an holy Seed, that they are internally regenerate or ſanctified from the Womb, but that they are included in the external Diſpenſation of the Covenant of Grace*, p. 411. Here I think the learned Doctor has Recourſe to a ſtale Set of unmeaning Terms: For I never could as yet prevail with any Body to explain, what is intended by the external Diſpenſation of the Covenant of Grace, as limited to the Infants of Believers, rather than to others. If by it is meant, that they have a Right to Ordinances, 'tis a fruitleſs begging of the Queſtion in Debate; if it be any Thing elſe, I deſire to know in plain Words what it is. Are not the Infants of irreligious Neighbours under the external Diſpenſation (in this City for Inſtance) as much as the Infants of Believers? Are not the Doors of Churches

Churches and of Places of Worſhip open, equally to inſtruct each of theſe, in the Knowledge of the true God, as they grow up to Years of Underſtanding? Are they not born under the ſame external Diſpenſation of the Goſpel? I readily acknowledge, tha' the Prayers and private Inſtructions of pious Parents, are very great Privileges to their Children; but what are theſe Things to make up a *federal Holineſs?* Is there any greater Aptitude or natural Inclination in the Infants of believing Parents, than in others, to be truly religious? If the Doctor will aſſert this, 'tis affirming ſomething to the Purpoſe, provided it can be prov'd. But when he ſeriouſly reflects upon the great Licenciouſneſs, and dark Degeneracy among the riſing Generation of the preſent Diſſenters, he will have no great Reaſon to build upon this pretended *federal Holineſs.* The greater is the Pity, and the more is the Caſe to be lamented, they wofully ſwerve from the exemplary Piety of their Anceſtors; many of them are very indifferent what Form of Religion to take up, and whether any at all. †

But 'tis added, *That God muſt be ſuppoſed to have a greater Regard to them than unto others, who are ſtiled* unclean, *p.* 411. Now, becauſe the Word *Believer*, is, by the Propagation of the Goſpel, become a Sort of an ambiguous

† See the Reverend Mr. *A. Taylor*'s Sermon in *Lime-ſtreet.*

Term,

Term, it may be neceſſary to explain this Matter a little. A *Believer*, at the firſt Promulgation of the Goſpel, was *one* who acknowledged the true God, and profeſſed Faith in the *Meſſiah*, in Oppoſition to an Infidel, *i. e.* an *Idolater*; but a *Believer* in the common Acceptation in our Day, is one who has the *Faith of the Operation of God, or the Faith of God's Elect*, in Contradiſtinction to a *Nominal Chriſtian*, who (ſtrictly ſpeaking) has only a notional Faith in the Exiſtence of the true God and Chriſt. I deſire to know where the Children of theſe merely Nominal Chriſtians (who in Reality muſt be Unbelievers) are ſtiled *Unclean?* as the learned Doctor expreſſes it. If they are no where called *unclean*, then they muſt be *clean* or *holy* in his Senſe, for there is no *Medium* in this Caſe. And we are not ſpeaking of Children between a *Chriſtian* and an *Idolater*, as was the Inſtance of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. but we are ſpeaking of Children between *Nominal Chriſtian* Parents; if theſe are *clean* and *holy*, then they have as much Right to Baptiſm upon this Foot, as the Children of the ſtricteſt Believers, who have the *Faith of God's Elect*. Therefore the Senſe of the Reverend Aſſembly of Divines, and of the Doctor, muſt be, that the Infants of Nominal Chriſtians have an equal and undiſtinguiſh'd Right to Baptiſm; unleſs it be ſaid, that their Claim riſes or falls, as there ſeems to be more or leſs Religion appearing in the Parents, which I think, is trifling with the poor Babes to a great

Degree,

Degree. And I have obſerv'd already, that the Infant of a graceleſs *Jew*, had as much Right to Circumciſion under the former Diſpenſation, as the Infant of the holieſt *Man* in the Land; and ſo have the Infants of all Nominal Chriſtians an equal Claim to Baptiſm, or there is nothing in the Pretence of *Pædobaptiſm* in general. I add further, that when the worthy Doctor ſays, *God muſt be ſuppoſed to have a greater Regard to the Children of true Believers* than to thoſe of *Nominal Chriſtians*; as I have fairly ſtated the Diſtinction, this Propoſition is not defenſible; for both Scripture and Experience contradict it; in ſhewing that the Children of ignorant and profane *Nominal Chriſtians*, are thro' ſovereign Grace, often effectually called; when ſometimes on the other Hand, the Children of *True Believers* (and that in the beſt Judgment of Charity) are ſuffered to go on in Sin. Therefore this preferable Regard, ſo much inſiſted on, whatever it be, is not worth mentioning, as a diſcriminating Character of any Sort of Infants among us, to give them a Title to Baptiſm.

I muſt not diſmiſs this Head, without taking ſome Notice of the Holineſs mention'd by the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy*; becauſe it is thought the ſtrongeſt Ground in the New Teſtament, in the Eſteem of divers great Men, for the Defence of *Pædobaptiſm*. And I obſerve,

1. It cannot be *Jewiſh* Holineſs of Seed, that is intended here; for the *Jewiſh* Holineſs conſiſted in the lawful Iſſue of a *Jewiſh* Man, and a *Jewiſh* Woman: But if a *Jewiſh* Man cohabited with a *Heathen* Woman, and even married her, to have Iſſue by her, yet that was not accounted the holy Seed: as may be eaſily ſeen in the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*.

2. The Apoſtle ſpeaks here of a *Heathen* Couple, the one converted to Chriſtianity, and the other remaining an Idolater; aſſuring them, that if they did not part wilfully, their Difference in Religion need not part them at all. Now this is far from being like the *Jewiſh* Holineſs; for that did ſtrictly forbid their intermarrying with Idolaters; nay, they were obliged to put away their Heathen-Wives, even after having Children by them. So that there is no rational Proportion between theſe two Points; and therefore it cannot well be ſuppoſed, that the Apoſtle ſhould make uſe of the Expreſſion, with any View to this *federal Holineſs* of the *Jewiſh* Kind.

3. If a *Jewiſh* Man and Wife parted upon any Score that could not be juſtified, their ſucceeding Children by any others, would be *unclean* and *unholy*, by the Law of God. Raſh Divorces being ſuch Things as God never approv'd of; and what our Saviour condemned in the *Jews*. And this ſeems to be what the Apoſtle was laying before the *Corinthians*, as if he had ſaid, " Should a Man obſtinately put away his Wife " upon the Account of Religion, when ſhe is wil-

" ling

" ling and deſirous to abide and live honeſtly " with him; or ſhould a Wife wilfully depart " from her Husband, when he civilly and af- " fectionately entreats her to abide in her con- " jugal Relation, the one or the other being " guilty in this Caſe, the future Children had " by any others, would be accounted *unclean*;" Nay there was a double Miſchief attended ſuch a Separation; not only the ſucceeding Children born to the guilty Perſon by another, would be ſure to be *unclean*, but alſo their Children had before this Separation, would be in Danger of being reproach'd as *infamous*: for the World would be ready to paſs a very hard Sentence upon the Offspring of ſuch Parents, as play'd faſt and looſe with their Marriage-State; nor would ſuch a Cenſure be paſs'd without ſome Colour of Reaſon: For the uſual Diſtinction in all civiliz'd Nations, between Children born in Marriage and out of Marriage, has always been, that of *clean* and *unclean*: therefore, 'tis no wonder that the Apoſtle in this Place, ſpeaking of Marriage (not of Baptiſm) ſhould conform himſelf to the common Mode of Speech, in calling Children *clean* or *unclean*, *holy* or *unholy*, according as their Parents either kept together, in the honourable State of Matrimony, or parted at Pleaſure, as unclean People do, after they have liv'd together in a vile Manner for ſome Time. And indeed *holy Matrimony* is a known Phraſe in the *Engliſh* Tongue; and the Scripture-Terms run much upon this Strain, as for *every one to know how to*

poſſeſs his Veſſel in Sanctification and Honour. Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefil'd. Theſe Paſſages illuſtrate and juſtify the Apoſtle's Diction and Phraſeology in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. without having any Manner of Regard to either, the *Baptiſm*, or *federal Holineſs* of Children, in the leaſt.

'Tis very obſervable alſo, that after the learned Doctor had trac'd this Buſineſs by a nice and skilful Diſquiſition, he was not able to fix a determinate *Idea* to it. But having repreſented it in the Negative, he is loth to come to any poſitive Concluſion; and yet he ſays, *'tis not a Word without an Idea affix'd to it. Therefore* (he adds) *we muſt underſtand thereby, an Holineſs in the loweſt Senſe of the Word, as Children are ſaid to be an Heritage of the Lord, and the Fruit of the Womb his Reward.*

I cannot readily diſcern any more in theſe Texts, than that it is the abſolute Prerogative of God, to give or deny Children to married People. And if this be the Sum of what this Matter amounts to, then divers of the moſt ignorant and profane People in this Nation, have as large a Share of this Bleſſing of *federal Holineſs*, as any the moſt religious Families among us. And thus it ſeems, this Priviledge, pretended to be deriv'd from Father or Mother only, to the Children, upon a cloſe Examination and Purſuit of it, diſappears like a Phantome, and dwindles into nothing.

On the other Hand, I muſt freely acknowledge, that I can form a ſatisfactory Conception

tion

tion of the *Abrahamic federal Holineſs.* For God ſingled out *Abraham* and his Poſterity, from all the Nations of the Earth; to be to him a *choſen People, a peculiar Treaſure.* He allotted them a noble hereditary Patrimony, granted them ſignal Privileges and Immunities, took 'em under his ſpecial Tuition, gave 'em holy Laws, ſuch as were given to no other People, and order'd them to keep themſelves diſtinct and ſeparate from all other Nations, by marrying purely among their own Tribes, that the holy Seed might be preſerv'd entire. But there were very important Reaſons for this Sort of *federal Holineſs*; for the *Meſſiah* was to come out of *Abraham*'s Loins: Nay farther, *Abraham*, and his Seed thro' *Iſaac*, were typical of *Chriſt* and the *Elect* under the New Teſtament. Here is a viſible Foundation for eſtabliſhing *federal Holineſs* in the Houſe and Lineage of *Abraham.* Beſides, God had determin'd to raiſe out of the Seed of *Abraham*, not only a large and a powerful Nation, but alſo to erect to himſelf a very glorious Church, wherein there appear'd extraordinary Men, *Patriarchs, Prophets* and *Kings*, eminent for *Holineſs.*

Now, I would ask, where ſhall we find the *Perſon* or *Perſons*, the *Family* or *Families*, the *Nation* or *Nations*, with whom God has enter'd into Covenant, or eſtabliſhed *federal Holineſs*, after the *Abrahamic Model?* Where, and to whom was there a *Transfer* made of this *federal Holineſs*, to be deriv'd from Father to Son, as 'twas in *Jewiſh* Line? I perſuade

my ſelf, that no Diſtinction of Men will openly avow, that this Buſineſs is confin'd to ſome particular Societies. This would be ſuch a barefac'd Aſſumption, and indeed a Violation of Chriſtian Charity, not to be overlook'd by other Denominations. But if it be ſaid, that this *federal Holineſs* was tranſmitted from the *Jews* to the *Gentiles* in the Lump, upon their Converſion by whole Nations to Chriſtianity; if this be the Caſe, I ſay, then Infant-Baptiſm ought to be ſupported upon a National Foot, as Circumciſion was among the *Jews*, *i. e.* allow'd in common without Exception to all the *Iſraelitiſh* Families. And indeed *Pædobaptiſm* ſeems to me a more rational Practice upon this Plan, than upon the odd Method fix'd by the Reverend Aſſembly of Divines, and defended by the learned Doctor, in diſtinguiſhing Families in a Chriſtian Nation into *Believers* or *Unbelievers*; and then to be ſometimes forc'd to ſubdiſtinguiſh again, between the Parents, the one believing and the other not believing (tho' both theſe formally own the ſame God and Saviour) before their Infant's Claim to Baptiſm can be ſecured. I add, that if it be ſtifly inſiſted upon, that this *federal Holineſs* under the Goſpel, is confin'd only to Believers in the ſtricteſt Senſe, (*i. e.* the Elect) theſe Conſequences muſt unavoidably attend it.

1. That 'tis a very nice and hazardous Point to baptize Infants; for, who knows what their Parents are? Since a Hypocrite often makes as fair an outward Shew, as a real Saint.

2. This

2. This Doctrine muſt ſuppoſe the Elect to beget Elect, and that there be a Succeſſion of them; or it cannot be a permament Thing: For if the immediate Children ſhould prove wicked Men and Women, then the Infants of the third Generation have no Right to Baptiſm; unleſs you will go back over the Heads of the proper Parents, to the Grand-father or Grand-mother, to prove their Claim to it. If it be ſaid, that 'tis fluctuating ond tranſient, from one Family to another; this renders it, a ſtill more difficult Task, to find out the myſterious Nature of this fleeting *federal Holineſs* among the *Gentiles*. Whereas the Thing was lineal and ſucceſſive in the Nation of the *Jews*.

3. 'Tis not only certain, but obvious, that it comes to paſs in the Methods of Providence, that the Children of very indifferent, nay, wicked Parents, are themſelves ſavingly converted; or, in plainer Terms, become true Believers. Theſe being deſcended from ſuch Parents, had no Right to their Baptiſm in Infancy; for there was no *federal Holineſs* in the Caſe; how then can their Baptiſm be juſtified? Either they had a Right to it, or they had not; if they had, I would fain know upon what Ground: for it ſeems it can't be defended upon the learned Doctor's Principle; becauſe he requires, that one of the Parents, at leaſt, ſhould be a true Believer, in order to baptize the Children. If they had not a Right to it, how can it be valid? Or ought not theſe Perſons rather to be baptiz'd

after a due Manner, upon their own *perſonal* Profeſſion of Faith? I choſe to put this Caſe, becauſe 'tis what frequently occurs to us in our Baptiſt-Congregations.

So that the plain Truth ſeems, to me, to be this; When the *Jews* rejected the *Meſſiah*, God was pleaſed to diſſolve, or at leaſt to ſuſpend his Covenant with them for a Time. From that Period all *federal Holineſs* ceaſed, or departed from them. But the bleſſed God has not thought fit ever ſince, to enter into any ſuch Meaſures with others, ſo as to engage with any other *Perſon*, *Family* or *Nation*, to ſecure a Succeſſion of People to himſelf, as he had done till that Time, out of the Lineage of *Abraham*. He does not ſtand ſo related now to any People upon Earth; nor does this *federal Holineſs* ſubſiſt in any *Blood* or *Kindred* at preſent, that we know of; much leſs is it deſigned to be the Foundation of Goſpel-Baptiſm. The New Teſtament has furniſhed us, with expreſs and ample Directions, how and to whom we are to adminiſter this Ordinance, without having Recourſe to ſuch a dark, and indeed unintelligible Scheme; eſpecially upon the learned Doctor's Principle. And yet as groundleſs as this Pretenſion of *ſeminal* or *federal Holineſs* ſeems to be, I am ſenſible, 'tis very plauſibly urg'd; and by help of the skilful Refinements of learned Men, in the laſt and preſent Age, it proves one of the moſt engaging Motives, for many affectionate Parents to give Baptiſm

to

to their Infants: For herein they are made to belive, that they ſtand as *ſmaller federal Heads*, and in ſome Sort of Imitation of the great *Patriarch Abraham.*

There are but few Things more, in Regard to the Subjects of Baptiſm, which I ſhall take Notice of.

1. We are told, that *the Lord's Supper is inſtituted in the Room of the Paſſover, and that Baptiſm comes in the Room of Circumciſion*, p. 412. Now ſuppoſing this might be allowed in the general, without any Difficulty, yet it cannot be admitted in the particular Application of Circumſtances. The *Pædobaptiſts* themſelves will not agree to it. As for Inſtance, the Infants of the *Jewiſh* Families, were to partake of the Paſſover; 'twas their Right, and the Duty of their Parents,as far as I can ſee, from the Inſtitution of it, to admit them to it. For I think, 'tis no difficult Matter to prove, that the Childten of their Families, did eat of the Paſſover, as ſoon as they could eat Fleſh and Bread, which is known to be pretty early, and long before they come to Years of Underſtanding. For this was the plain Rule, *They were to take a Lamb either for one whole Houſe, or for two adjoining Houſes, according to the Number of the Souls, according to their Eating, they were to make Count for the Lamb.* Exod. 12. Now, if the *Pædobaptiſts* will not conform to the Rules of the Paſſover, in bringing their Infants to the Lord's Supper, why ſhould they unrea-

unreaſonably expect us to bring our Infants to Baptiſm, according to the Rules of Circumciſion? If it be ſaid, that there are peculiar Qualifications requir'd for the Lord's-Supper; we urge with equal Reaſon, that there are peculiar and expreſs Qualifications requir'd for Baptiſm.

2. As for the Baptiſm unto *Moſes* in the *Red-ſea*, p. 113. there are but few People, of true Judgment, who will take it in a literal Senſe; 'tis an Allegory, and the Apoſtle only alludes to it. And the learned Doctor himſelf ſeems to be of this Opinion, when he agrees with Dr. *Lightfoot*, in ſuppoſing, *That the whole Congregation, of which the Infants, which they had in their Arms, were a Part, were ſolemnly devotod to God at that Time; which he cannot but conclude to be more agreeable to the Senſe of the Word baptize, than that which ſome Criticks give, who ſuppoſe that nothing is intended by it, but their being wet*, &c. *p.* 413. But I have ſhewn already elſewhere, that no Man can prove that the *Iſraelites* were wet, ſo much as in Regard their outward Garments; much leſs is it probable, that their little Infants, tenderly wrap'd up in their Parents Arms, ſhould be expoſed to the Daſhings of the Waves. The Ground of this Miſtake ſeems to be this; ſome Writers have haſtily concluded, that the Paſſage thro' the Sea, was, but as a Lane of few Feet wide; and that both the *Cloud* and the *Sea* drop'd upon the People

as

as they went along. Whereas the Scripture ſays nothing of either of theſe Incidents; but declares the contrary, that they went as on *dry Land*, and that the *Waters were as a Wall to them on the Right Hand and on the Left.* And whoſoever will duly advert to the Number of Perſons that paſs'd, *Exod.* 12. 37. they are ſaid to be *Six hundred Thouſand on Foot, that were Men, beſides Children; and a mix'd Multitude* (of *Egyptions*, or others, who followed them) *went up alſo with them; and Flocks and Herds, even very much Cattle.* Now let any conſiderate Man judge, what Front ſuch an Army muſt make in their March, and to perform it in about Twelve Hours; for they had but one ſingle Night to go thro' the Sea; as may be ſeen by a careful Reading of the Hiſtory: How extenſive then muſt their Front be, to facilitate and expedite the Motion of ſo many Hundred thouſand Men, with their Women, Children, and mere Infants, in Proportion; together with their Flocks, Herds and Beaſts of Burden for their Baggage, *&c.* All theſe Circumſtances duly weigh'd, the Opening of the Sea, muſt in all Reaſon, be ſuppoſed to be ſeveral Furlongs wide; and I think it can't well be imagin'd, that the Daſhings of the Waters reach'd the Center of this vaſt Army; much leſs did the Wet affect the tender Infants, who, to be ſure, on this Occaſion were moſt carefully ſecur'd by the indulgent Parents. But if it be ſtill urg'd, that the *Sprinklings* of the Waves, and *Daſhings* of Sea did reach the very Center

of

of this huge Multitude, then I alledge, that the Ranks which were neareſt the Sea on both Sides, on the Right and left, were in a miſerably wet Condition: And what I affirm further, is, that this Suppoſition flatly contradicts the Scripture; *For 'tis ſaid, the Children of Iſrael walked upon dry Land in the midſt of the Sea.* But the learned Doctor ſeems to have a ſingular Notion of this Baptiſm unto *Moſes*, when he tells us, *That the Apoſtle's Meaning is, that the whole Congregation was baptiz'd into* Moſes, *ſoon after they were delivered from the* Egyptians, *while they were encamp'd at the Sea-ſhore*, p. 414. But as this is a mere Conjecture, and no where grounded in Scripture, I am not concerned to refute it. As to the Cloud in this Tranſaction, it conſiſted of a *dark* and a *bright* Side; the *dark hinder* Part might break in a Tempeſt upon the *Egyptians*, as appears from *Pſalm* 77. 17. but the *bright Fore-part*, was a fiery, ſhining and comfortable *Guide* for the *Hebrews*, in their Night's Journey. So that I apprehend, 'tis impoſſible to prove any literal Baptiſm from this Inſtance. But I ſhould think, 'tis a very remote and improper Way of attempting the Proof of Infant-Baptiſm, in any Senſe whatſoever.

The learned Dr. *Lightfoot* is introduced as having taken a Method to account for the Silence of the Scripture, as to the Matter of *Pædobaptiſm*, *viz. That Baptiſm was well enough known to the* Jews, *as practiſed by them under the*

the Ceremonial Law, p. 413. *The Reverend Dr.* Ridgley *declares himſelf of this Opinion*, p. 414 Now, I deſire to know (and my Requeſt is but very reaſonable) where the Paſſage is, in the Ceremonial Law, which ſhews that God had inſtituted ſuch a Baptiſm. If there be no ſuch Paſſage to be found, as I am well ſatisfied there is not, with what Deſign can theſe learned Gentlemen paſs their Authority and Credit from one to another, to make the common People believe, that ſuch a Baptiſm was appointed of God under the Ceremonial Law? If it be ſaid, that the *Jews* did practiſe it, whether it was of God, or themſelves; this is ſo far from mending the Matter, that, in my Opinion, it makes it much worſe: For 'tis, in Effect, charging our Lord Chriſt with having borrowed Goſpel-Baptiſm, from a ſuperſtitious Invention of the *Jews*; and a greater Reproach, I think, cannot be deriv'd upon this Ordinance. So that in what Light ſoever we take this Affair, it bears no good Face. Beſides there are ſome very ancient Writers among the *Jews*, who altogether deny this Practice, as Rabbi *Eliezer* for Inſtance, and he is thought to be of the Side of the *Karræi*, or Scripturarians, and conſequently may deſerve greater Credit. And the learned * Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, mentioning him and *Rabbi Joſhua*, in regard to this Buſineſs, asks,

* Annot. in 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.

To

To which of theſe ſhall I yield my Belief? To Eliezer, *who affirms that which the Scripture affirms,* (i. e. *that a Proſelyte circumciſed and not baptiz'd was a true Proſelyte*) *or to* Joſhua, *who affirms that which the Scripture no where mentions,* &c.

Again Dr. *Lightfoot* is introduced in an Inſtance, wherein he gives an unjuſt Repreſentation of the Baptiſm of *John.* I may venture to call it unjuſt; for it is not true in Fact. For he affirms, that the *Jews* did not ask *John, Why doſt thou make uſe of this Right of baptizing? but what is thy Warrant, or who ſent thee to baptize?* Whereas, on the other Hand, the Scripture expreſly declares, that the Meſſengers ſent by the *Jews,* did aſk *John,* both, *Who art thou?* and, *Why baptizeſt thou? John* 1. 19, 25.

The ſame learned Doctor is cited, as farther adding, that *John* and *Chriſt took the Baptiſm as they found it in the* Jewiſh *Church*; but Dr. *Ridgley* ſeems to correct or explain this bold Aſſertion, by informing us, *That he means the Ordinance in general, without Regard to ſome Circumſtances, in which Chriſt's Baptiſm differed from that which was practiſed under the Ceremonial Law:* But he carefully lets us know, that *this Baptiſm in the* Jewiſh *Church was applied to Infants. Therefore,* he ſays, *Our Saviour had no Occaſion when he inſtituted this Ordinance, to command them to baptize Infants in particular,* p. 414. We are now by the joint Authorities of theſe two learned Gentlemen,

men, let into the whole Myſtery, as to the Silence of the New Teſtament about Infant-Baptiſm; but 'tis a very dark Way by which we come at this Secret. 'Tis a very far-fetch'd Method, if not an unreaſonable one, of entailling *Pædobaptiſm* upon us. For I have obſerv'd already, that the Ceremonial Law knows nothing of this Matter. I have likewiſe ſhewn in the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe, what Sort of a Thing the *Talmud* is, from whence theſe Authorities are taken, and prov'd from good Writers, that it was not finiſhed till ſeveral hundred Years after the Expiration of the Ceremonial Law.

But if, for Argument Sake, we allow theſe learned Gentlemen their *Hypotheſis*, then I deſire theſe following Things may be conſidered.

1. That the *Jewiſh* Baptiſm was founded either upon *Revelation*, or upon their *own Superſtition*; the *former* cannot be prov'd, the *latter* is too ſcandalous to be inſiſted upon.

2. If the *Jews* in general were baptiz'd in their own Church, then Multitudes of them were baptiz'd twice; for *John* muſt be a Rebaptizer, and thoſe who ſubmitted to the Ordinance at his Hands, were certainly the firſt *Anabaptiſts* that ever appeared in the World.

3. If *John* took up Baptiſm as he found it in the *Jewiſh* Church, and that it was in ordinary

dinary given to Infants, then he was not faithful in his Office; for he baptiz'd no Infants; nor can it be prov'd, that he ever adminiſtred this Ordinance to any one ſingle Infant, amidſt the many Hundreds, if not Thouſands of adult Perſons, which we may well ſuppoſe were baptiz'd by him and his Diſciples.

4. 'Tis undoubted, that the Deſign of our Lord Chriſt was to make us believe, that the Baptiſm of *John* was from God, and not from the *Jews*; by the Queſtion he propoſed to them. *Was it from Heaven or of Men?* Mark 11. 30. And 'tis elſewhere called the *Counſel of God.* Can any one imagine that the Holy Ghoſt would have recorded Things after this Manner, if the Baptiſm of *John* had been an *old* Jewiſh *Superſtition?* But it ſeems we muſt be faced down, *That* John *and* Chriſt *took up Baptiſm as they found it in the* Jewiſh *Church*; and theſe confident Aſſurances muſt be perpetually returned upon us, tho' they involve the Authors of them in endleſs Abſurdities, and unavoidable Contradictions.

It may be neceſſary now, briefly to review the Authorities which the learned Doctor has produced from *Chriſtian Antiquity*, to countenance *Pædobaptiſm.* The firſt he makes uſe of, is that of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Queſt. & Reſp.* Q. 102. but I have very juſt Exceptions to make to this Citation: As,

1. If

1. If the Genuinneſs of it were allow'd, 'twill by no Means prove Infant-Baptiſm; for it does not ſpeak of it; and therefore I wonder that the learned Doctor ſhould offer this, and not the 56 Q. where the Thing it ſelf is mentioned, and a very curious Point concerning it, is agitated. But,

2. The very Piece itſelf is chargeable as ſpurious; and is only father'd upon *Juſtin Martyr*. Dr. *Hammond* does not inſiſt upon it as his, and prudently calls it only an ancient Piece. The late very learned Mr. *Bingham* is of the ſame Mind: But Mr. *Dupin* * gives undeniable Arguments to prove it manifeſtly ſpurious. He ſays theſe Queſtions are too nice for *Juſtin*'s Age, and have been attributed by ſeveral to *Theodoret* (who liv'd in the fifth Century) on Account of the Conformity of the Stile, and certain Expreſſions *Theodoret* affected. Inſtead of reciting any other Reaſons, it will be ſufficient for me to take Notice, that he charges the Author with quoting *Origen*, in the 82 and 88 Queſtions, *Irenæus* in the 115, and the *Manichees* in the 127. Now if we only conſider the ſingle Inſtance of quoting *Origen*, who flouriſhed about 230, and allow *Juſtin* to have appeared about 155, which is the fartheſt Computation that is commonly

* *Vide* Dupin in Juſtin.

made, for ſome will have him to have been about 140 Years after Chriſt: Be it as it will, 'tis not very probable, that *Origen* was born while *Juſtin* liv'd. And this is ſufficient to deſtroy the Credit of this Piece, as aſcrib'd to *Juſtin*, in the Eſteem of all equitable Judges. I may add, that I have two good Editions of *Juſtin* now by me, and they verify this Charge. As to the other Teſtimony out of this Father, wherein the Doctor refers to his ſecond Apology, I think he muſt mean the Paſſage which I have tranſcribed at large, *p.* 161. of this Treatiſe. The ſmall Taſte which we have of it, ſeems to direct us to that. Now, I deſire any impartial Reader to conſult the Place, and he will find there is no Regard had to Infant-Baptiſm. But on the other Hand, there is a fair Account of their admitting Perſons to Baptiſm upon Profeſſion of Faith, after Catechetick Inſtruction; and of their *leading of them where there was Water*, in order to baptize them. *Juſtin* upon this Occaſion, had the faireſt Opportunity imaginable to mention Infant-Baptiſm, had any ſuch Thing been practiſed in his Time. For he profeſſes that he related their Cuſtom in an honeſt and undiſſembled Manner: So that I conclude that this Citation alſo is of no Uſe at all to the learned Doctor.

The next Authority that is offered, is that of *Irenæus*; but there are ſeveral Things may be urg'd to the Diſadvantage of this Evidence. 1. Some learned *Pædobaptiſts* have queſtion'd the Genuinneſs of this Chapter, and Cardinal *Baronius*

Baronius, in particular, thinks 'tis ſpurious. For the latter End of it contradicts the Beginning, and makes our Saviour near 50 Years of Age when he died. The late learned Dr. *Gale* inſiſts upon this very juſtly againſt Mr. *Wall*; that if an Author appears to be not only inconſiſtent with himſelf, but alſo to oppoſe a Truth ſo well known, as the Age of our Lord when crucified, ſuch a one's Teſtimony is not much to be depended upon, in that Part of his Works at leaſt: and it looks as if an unskilful or deſigning Tranſlator had a Hand in corrupting this Chapter.

3. Since the whole Streſs of the Paſſage in this Argument, between the *Pædobaptiſts* and us, depends upon the Meaning of the Word *Renaſcuntur*, I ſhall tranſcribe the Words of *Irenæus*, as far as they are neceſſary to give Light in this Affair. Speaking of our Lord Chriſt, as having arrived at Years of Maturity, and having become a *Teacher*, and having paſs'd thro' the previous Stages of Life, he ſays, " * Sanctifying every Age thro' that Likneſs " which it bore to him. He came to ſave all " by himſelf; all, I ſay, who are born again

---

* Sed omnem ætatem ſanctificans per illam, quæ ad ipſum erat, ſimilitudinem. Omnes enim venit per ſemet ipſum ſalvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renaſcuntur in Deum, Infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & ſeniores.

Iren. Lib. 2. cap. 22. Edit. Pariſ. 1710.

" unto God, Infants, and little ones, and Chil-
" dren, and young Men and old Men.

Now, allowing this Paſſage to be truly tranſlated, and that it expreſſes the genuine Senſe of *Irenæus*, I don't think 'tis ſufficient to ſay, that he means being *baptiz'd*, by *Renaſcuntur (born again)* in this Place. For 'tis certain, that Infants are *born again*, of the Spirit, in the ſtrict Senſe of the New Teſtament, or they *can't enter into Heaven.* Beſides the Words immediately following in this Chapter, ſhew plainly, that the Deſign of the Author was to prove, that our Lord had ſanctified every Stage of Life by taking our Nature upon him, and living therein. 'Tis ſaid therefore, * " He paſs'd thro' " every Age, and became an Infant to Infants, " ſanctifying Infants; he was a little one in " little ones, ſanctifying thoſe of this Age, and " becoming an Example to them of Piety, " Juſtice and Subjection, *&c.*" So that upon reading the whole Paſſage, it appears a very uncertain Foundation to build Infant-Baptiſm upon; for 'tis inward Renovation that ſeems to be intended here.

As for *Gregory Nazianzen*, I think, he was rather againſt the common modern Way of bap-

---

* Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, & infantibus infans factus, ſanctificans Infantes: in parvulis parvulus, ſanctificans hanc ipſam habentes ætatem, ſimul & Exemplum illis pietatis effectus, & juſtitiæ, & ſubjectionis, &c. ibid.

tizing

tizing Infants; for he thought it better to defer it, till they were about three Years old, but in caſe only of danger of Death, to give it them immediately after they were born, for fear they ſhould die without it. His Words, as cited by the learned Mr. *Bingham*, are theſe; "* What ſay you to thoſe who are yet Infants, "and are not in a Capacity to be ſenſible either "of the Grace, or of the Loſs of it? Shall we "baptize them too? Yea by all means, if any "Danger ſo require it: For it is better that "they ſhould be ſanctified without their own "Senſe of it, than that they ſhould die unſeal'd "and uninitiated. And the Ground of this is "Circumciſion which was given on the eighth "Day. —— As for others, I give my Opini-"on that they ſhould ſtay three Years, or there-"abouts, till they can hear the myſtical Words, "and make Anſwers to them." I ſhould think, that this is more againſt the ordinary Practice of Infant-Baptiſm, than for it.

And by the Way, this may help us to underſtand the true Reaſon, why divers Perſons of Note in the antient Church, tho' born of Chriſtian Parents, yet were not baptiz'd in their Infancy; for it ſeems it was thought adviſeable to defer their Baptiſm till they could anſwer for themſelves, eſpecially, if there was a Probability that the Infants would live. And

---

* Naz. Orat. 40. de Baptiſmo. Tom. 2. p. 658. apud Bingham, Orig. Eccl. V. 1. p. 481, 482.

Gregory

Gregory Nazianzen flouriſhed in the fourth Century, about 370 Years after Chriſt.

Having hitherto attended the learned Doctor in what he had to offer, for Infants being the proper Subjects of Baptiſm; I ſhall now conſider what he has to urge againſt the primitive Mode of *Dipping*, and for the preſent Method of *ſprinkling* or *Pouring* in ordinary Baptiſm. And it may not be improper to premiſe this general Remark upon his ſingular Conduct in this Affair; *viz.* that he never acknowledges *Dipping* to have been ſo much as once uſed, according to the Scripture-Account: He has reſolutely ſet out with a Deſign to oppoſe it, and I think he has ſteadily kept to his Reſolution: 'tis a Method, that very few Writers of Note have taken, in any Nation; but as for our own *Engliſh* Writers of any Eminence, they have generally made very open and fair Conceſſions in this Caſe.

And tho' the Reverend *Aſſembly of Divines* have warily defin'd Baptiſm in general, to be *waſhing with Water*, in the *Catechiſm*; yet they don't ſcruple to acknowledge, that *that Waſhing* was by *Dipping* in the *primitive* Times. This is evident to any one who will peruſe their *Annotations*. So the excellent Mr. *Pool*, Dr. *Hammond*, and Dr. *Whitby*, all unreſervedly declare the ſame Thing. 'Twould be endleſs to attempt to reckon up, the ſmaller Tracts of Multitudes of the moſt learned Men of the laſt and preſent Age, who readily confeſs this. 'Tis obſervable, that foreign Writers are no leſs willing

willing to make this honeſt Acknowledgment: and a Cloud of credible Witneſſes may be produced in Evidence to this Purpoſe. I may add, that it is eaſily demonſtrated from the Fathers, Schoolmen, Reformers, and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, as well as modern Writers, that *Dipping* was uſed and continued in the *Chriſtian* Church for many hundred Years ſucceſſively. Now, the Queſtion with me, is, (as much as I eſteem him) whether Dr. *Ridgley* accompanied and ſupported only by a few partial Men, and thoſe the meaner and more inſignificant of modern Writers, will have Weight enough to counterballance the venerable Authorities abovementioned. Or rather, 'tis out of all Queſtion, that ſuch a Task is too heavy for any ſingle Man to undertake, and indeed that 'tis abſolutely impoſſible for any Body of Men, to ſtem the Torrent of ſuch powerful concurring Evidences. The ſureſt Way to judge and be ſatisfied, is to examine the Merit of what the learned Doctor has advanc'd, to deſtroy the Credit of *Dipping*, and to eſtabliſh that of *Sprinkling* or *Pouring*. And in order hereunto, I ſhall briefly review the following Inſtances.

1. The firſt (and chief Thing indeed) preſented to us, is a Sketch of ſome *Critical Remarks*, taken out of the *poſthumous* Works of the Reverend Dr. *Owen*; and tho' I ſincerely declare, that I have an uncommon Veneration for the Memory of that every Way great and worthy Gentleman, yet were I to ſpeak my

Mind out on the other Hand, I am of Opinion, that if his Friends had ſtudied how to make him look little, they could not have found a more effectual Way, than by publiſhing theſe *Remarks* upon *Dipping*: For either what is advanc'd in them cannot be made good, or muſt appear to be a fair Conceſſion of all that the *Baptiſts* can wiſh for, or want, *viz. That the original Signification of the Word* βαπτίζω *imports to dip.* And concluding, *That no honeſt Man who underſtands the* Greek *Tongue, can deny the Word to ſignify* to waſh, *as well as to* dip.

I never met with a *Baptiſt*, who underſtood any Thing of the Matter, that ever denied this. It does ſignify to waſh, but 'tis by Conſequence; and 'tis impoſſible to dip in fair Water without Waſhing: It neceſſarily implies and comprehends that, in the Nature of the Action, when 'tis perform'd in Water. But it never ſignifies to waſh *ſimply* without having Regard to *Dipping*. Nay, it ſignifies to dip into any Matter *abſolutely*, without regarding *Water* or any *other Liquid*. And the Reverend Dr. *Owen* has not offered to aſſert, that the Word in its native Signification imports to *ſprinkle* or *pour*: Had he found any good Authors, who render βαπτίζω, by *aſpergo*, *affundo* or *perfundo*, this would have been ſomewhat to the Purpoſe. Coming ſhort of this, is doing of nothing: For this is what the *Pædobaptiſts* muſt prove, to juſtify their own Practice; or elſe what they call *Baptiſm* is not perform'd

form'd according to the genuine Signification of the Word βαπτίζω, themſelves being Judges.

As for what that learned Gentleman ſaid, that βάπτω, when uſed in theſe Scriptures, *Luke* 16, 24. *Send Lazarus that he dip the Tip of his Finger in Water.* —— And *John* 13. 26. *He it is to whom I ſhall give a Sop when I have dip'd it. Theſe Scriptures denote only touching one Part of the Body,* and *not plunging.* I anſwer, that in the latter of theſe Places there was no Part of the Body concerned; for 'twas the *Sop* or *Morſel,* that was *dip'd.* And 'tis certain, that a Man may *dip* his *Morſel* in *Sauce,* without dipping any Part of himſelf. As for the former Place, if a Perſon *dips* the *Tip* of his *Finger* in Water, 'tis as proper and true *Dipping, ſo far,* as if it had been a *Dipping* of the *whole Body.*

And as to what the ſame learned Gentleman ſaid, that in *Rev.* 19. 13. where we read of a Veſture dip'd in Blood, *It is better rendred ſtained, by ſprinkling Blood upon it*; it may be well anſwer'd, that 'tis a figurative Expreſſion; and to judge of the *literal Signification* of Words, by *Rhetorical Speeches,* is a very uncertain, if not unjuſt Way of proceeding. And yet even under this Diſadvantage, the Ballance ſeems to be on our Side; 'tis a Veſture *dip'd in Blood,* that is, *ſtain'd ſo deep in it,* as if it had been *dip'd* or *dy'd in Blood:* So that the true Import of the Word is ſtrongly retained in this Place, notwithſtanding this Remark.

'Tis

'Tis very obſervable, that this worthy Gentleman owns, that the *Hebrew* Word טבל is moſtly rendred by βάπτω thro' all the Old Teſtament. The Exception he gives of its being rendred by the *Sept. Gen.* 37. 31. by μολύνω does not affect this Controverſy. The Ordinance of Baptiſm is handed to us thro' the *Greek* Tongue, and 'tis by that we muſt be determined. And therefore whether the *Seventy Tranſlators* imagin'd, that *Joſeph*'s Coat was *dawb'd* or *dip'd* in the *Blood of the Kid*, is of no Importance at all in this Debate.

But I am aſtoniſhed, when that Reverend Gentleman aſſures us, that βάπτω, in no Author, ever ſignifies to *dip*, but only *in order to Waſhing*, or *as the Means of Waſhing*, when the very contrary is glaringly true, as may be undeniably prov'd from divers Inſtances, and different Authors.

The late learn'd Dr. *Gale* has effectually done this; he was both a fair and an able Diſputant, and a Gentleman who had taken more Pains (and met with better Succeſs) in examining the true Meaning of the Word βάπτω, than Dr. *Owen* ſeem'd to have done, and perhaps might every Way be as well furniſhed with Leiſure, Capacity and Means ſo to do; and he has given us theſe following Inſtances, where βάπτω ſignifies to *dip* or *plunge* without any Manner of Regard had to *Waſhing*, or the *Means of Waſhing*.

His Words are theſe, " I have carefully ob-
" ſerv'd it a conſiderable Time, as it occurr'd
" in

" in Reading, and aſſure you I never found it " once uſed to ſignify to *pour* or *ſprinkle*, or " any Thing leſs than *Dipping*; and I may " challenge any Man to ſhew a ſingle Inſtance " of it, except in ſome *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* " of the latter corrupt Times, who retaining " the Words of the Inſtitution, and altering " the Thing, do, in this Caſe indeed, but no " other, extend the Word into a wider Senſe: " But prophane Authors, who lay under no " ſuch Biaſs, have made no ſuch Alteration. " 'Tis evident from them, the primary Mean- " ing is ſimply to *dip*, not only in *Water*, " but *any Matter*.

" Thus *Lycophron*, repreſenting *Caſſandra* " propheſying how *Oreſtes* ſhould puniſh *Cly-* " *temneſtra* for her Parricide, ſays, * *The Child* " *diſcovering his Father's Murder, ſhall, with* " *his own Hand* (βάψει) *thruſt his Sword in-* " *into the Viper's Body*; or as the great *Scali-* " *ger* has more literally tranſlated it, *Merget*, " ſhall *plunge* his *Sword* into the *Vipers Bowels*; " that is, *run her thro'*. It can't be pretended, " that this is a figurative Expreſſion, for the " Senſe of the Word appears to be natural and " direct, and to contain no Metaphor in it.

" Exactly the ſame Phraſe is that of *Sophocles*, " (ἔβαψας) † *Thou haſt dip'd or thruſt thy Sword* " *into the* Grecian *Army*; and *Plonger lè Epee*,

---

* Caſſand. v. 1121. Εἰς σπλάγχν' ἐχίδνης αὐτόχειρ βάψει ξίφος.

† Ajace, v. 95. Ἔβαψας ἔγχος εὖ πρὸς ἀργείων στρατῷ.

" in

" in this very Senſe, is common in the *French*
" Tongue. Mr. *Dryden* likewiſe expreſſes the
" *Poet*'s Senſe thus, in the 7th *Eneid*, *p.* 638.

" *Thus having ſaid, her ſmouldering Torch, impreſs'd,*
" *With her full Force, ſhe* plung'd *into her* Breaſt.

" *Homer* deſcribing *Ulyſſes* with his Compa-
" nions, putting out *Polyphemus*'s Eye with a
" burning Brand, and what Abundance of Blood
" iſſued and quench'd the Brand with a loud
" Hiſſing, illuſtrates it with this *Simile*, * *As*
" *when a Smith to harden a Hatchet or maſſy*
" *Pole-ax* (Ϭάῶλε) *dips them in cold Water.*
" If any one can doubt what the Word im-
" ports here, any Blackſmith's Boy will ſet
" him right, by an ocular Demonſtration.

As he goes on, he ſays, " I will now bring
" you an Inſtance or two from *Ariſtotle*, who
" abounds with them, but a few may ſuffice.
" *In his Treatiſe of the Soul*, Lib. 3. Cap. 12.
" he ſays, † *If a Man dips any Thing* (βάψει)
" *into Wax*, as far as it is *dip'd*, it is
" moved. Here 'tis impoſſible to queſtion
" the Meaning of the Word, *&c.* And a little
" lower, ‖ *The Flux in Elephants, is cured by*

---

* Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πελέκυν, μέγαν ἠὲ σκέπαρνον
Εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτει. Odyſſ. 9. v. 392.

† Εἰ εἰς κηρὸν βαφείη τις, μέχρι τοῦτο ἐκινήθη, ἕως ἔβαφε.

‖ Καὶ τὸν χόρτον εἰς μέλι βάπτοντες, διδόασιν ἐδίειν. Ariſtot. Hiſtor. Animal. Lib. 8. c. 26,

giving

" *giving them warm Water to drink*, and Hay *dip'd* (βάπτοντες) in Honey, *to eat.*

Again, ſpeaking of a Kind of Serpent bred in *Africa*, he ſays, " Thoſe who are bit by it, " uſe for a Remedy, *a certain* * *Stone, found* " *in the Sepulchre of one of their ancient Kings,* " *which they put into* ἀποβάπτοντες *the Wine they* " *drink.*

There are many more Inſtances to this Purpoſe, which may be ſeen in the learned Dr. *Gale*, and which I omit merely for Brevity's Sake. But from theſe already produc'd, the Reader may be enabled to judge, what little Credit there is to be given to theſe *poſthumous Remarks* of the Reverend Dr. *Owen*; and eſpecially, that there is no Dependance to be had, upon this undigeſted and groundleſs Aſſertion, *That in no other Author*, the Word (βάπτω) *does ever ſignify to dip, but only in Order to Waſhing, or as the Means of Waſhing:* Since the Paſſages above mention'd demonſtrate the contrary, and evidently prove from the beſt *Greek* Authors, that the Word is uſed to denote *Dipping*, when there is no Manner of Reference had to *Waſhing*, or even the *Means* of *Waſhing*.

There are ſome other Circumſtances and Conſiderations attending theſe Critical Remarks, which muſt not be altogether overlook'd: As when the ſame learned Gentleman

* Οὗ καὶ λέγεται ἄχος εἶναι λίθός τις, ὃν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τάφου βασιλέως τῶν ἀρχαίων, καὶ ἐν οἴνῳ ἀποβάπτοντες πίνουσι. Ibid. c. 29.

tells

tells us, that in 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. It is ſaid, *That Jonathan dip'd the End of his Rod in an Honey-comb: in which Place* (he ſays) *it cannot be underſtood of dipping it by Plunging:* I deſire to know, what *Dipping* there can poſſibly be without *Plunging*; or was there ever a *Dipping* by *Sprinkling?* Or again, Would it be proper to render the Word, he *poured* or *ſprinkled the End of his Rod into the Honey-comb?* For I think, that 'tis as allowable for me to argue *ex abſurdo*, in this Caſe, as 'tis for me to affirm, as I do, that *Dipping the End of his Rod into the Honey-comb*, is a Diction, very agreeable to the *Engliſh Idiom*, as well as ſuitable to the *Manner* and *Nature* of the Action.

Again, we are told by the ſame Reverend Author, that in *Lev.* 6.--17. and Chap. 9. 9 *The Prieſt is ſaid to dip his Finger in the Blood, which only intends his touching the Blood, ſo as to ſprinkle it:* Here I deſire alſo to be ſatisfied, whether the *Pædobaptiſt-Miniſters* do not *dip* their *Fingers* in the *Baſon of Water*, when they *ſprinkle* a Child in *Baptiſm?* I always apprehended that they did. And in the only one Inſtance I ever ſaw, I am ſure it was ſo done. When the Thing comes home to People, in their own ordinary Practice, they will perhaps be more eaſily convinc'd, that the Prieſt, of old did *dip his Finger in the Blood*, in order to ſprinkle with it.

The ſame learned Gentleman proceeds to give us his Thoughts of the Word βαπτίζω, that it *ſignifies to waſh*, and alſo, *that it no*

where

where ſignifies to dip, but as *denoting a Mode of, and in order to waſhing*. Here again, I am obliged to declare, that this Aſſertion will bear no Examination; nay, the very contrary is evidently prov'd by the late worthy Dr. *Gale*. He gives an Inſtance in theſe Words, "*Hera-*" *clides Ponticus*, a Diſciple of *Ariſtotle*'s, may "help us alſo, in fixing the Senſe of the Word; "for moralizing the Fable of *Mars*'s being "taken in a Net by *Vulcan*, he ſays, * *Nep-*" *tune* is ingeniouſly ſuppos'd to deliver *Mars* "from *Vulcan*, to ſignify, that when *a Piece* "*of Iron is taken red hot out of the Fire, and* "*put into the Water*, βαπτίζεται, *the Heat is* "*repelled and extinguiſhed by the contrary Na-*" *ture of the Water.*" This Paſſage has a manifeſt Alluſion to the Cuſtom of Smiths. There is no Intention of Waſhing in the Caſe: For Smiths don't uſe to put red-hot Iron into Water to *waſh* it, but to *cool* or *harden* it: So that it is *dip'd* without carrying in it the leaſt *Idea* of *Waſhing*.

Again, he gives an Inſtance out of *Strabo*, ſpeaking of a Rivulet in the South-parts of *Cappadocia*, he tells us, "† *Whoſe Waters are*

---

* Ποσειδῶν δ' ὁ ῥύμενος παρ' Ἡφαίστου τὸν Ἄρηα Πιθανῶς, ἐπειδήπερ ἐκ τῶν βανάυσων διάπυρος ὁ τοῦ σιδήρου μύδρος ἐλκυσθεὶς ὕδατι βαπτίζεται, καὶ τὸ φλογῶδες ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας φύσεως ὕδασι κατασβεσθὲν ἀναπάυεται. Heraclid. Pontic. Allegor. p. 495.

† Τῷ δὲ καθιεντι ἀκόντιον, ἄνωθεν εἰς τὸν Βόθρον, ἡ βία τοῦ ὕδατος ἀνίπρατζει Τοσοῦτον ὥστε μόλις βαπτίζεσθαι. Strabo, l. 12. p. 809.

ſo

" *ſo buoyant, that if an Arrow is thrown in,*
" *it will hardly ſink or be dip'd,* βαπτίζεσθαι,
" *into them.*

But after many Examples, Dr. *Gale* cloſes his third Letter in theſe Words, " I ſhall add " but one Inſtance more, which ſhall be out " of *Themiſtius*; who ſays, *The* * *Pilot can't* " *tell but he may ſave one in the Voyoge, that* " *had better be drown'd* [βαπτισαι] *ſunk in* " *the Sea.*

I can't think that any Perſon upon a ſerious Review of this Paſſage, will be able to imagine, that there is any *Waſhing* meant in it. 'Tis *Sinking* or *Drowniug* that muſt be abſolutely intended.

But the ſame very Reverend Gentleman (Dr. *Owen*) farther adds, that it is uſed in *Mark* 1. 8. *John* 1. 33. *Acts* 1. 5. in which Places it ſignifies to *pour*; *for the Expreſſion is equivocal.* I anſwer, the ſhorteſt and ſureſt Way to be undeceiv'd in this Caſe, is, to render the Word, by *pouring*, in thoſe Places. As for Inſtance, *Mark* 1. 8. *I indeed have poured you with Water*; *but he ſhall pour you with the Holy Ghoſt.* Who is there, that does not only ſee the Uncouthneſs, but alſo the Abſurdity of this Tranſlation? When he tells us, that the Paſſage is an Accompliſhment of the Pro-

---

* Οὔτε ὁ κυβερνήτης εἰ σώζει ἐν τῷ πλῷ, ἐν καὶ βαπτίσαι ἀμείνον ἦν. Themiſtii *Orat.* 4. p. 133.

N. B. Theſe Inſtances, with others of the like Kind, are to be found in Dr. *Gale*'s Reflections, p. 95, 96, 115, 117, 123, 129.

miſe,

miſe, *that the Holy Ghoſt ſhall be poured on them*; it may be juſtly anſwered, that if this interpretative Way be allowed, then the Word *(baptizing)* may as well ſignify, *ſending* or *giving*; for we read of *ſending the Comforter*, and *giving the Holy Spirit*; and ſo we ſhall never be able to come at the true *literal* Signification of the Word.

As for the Phraſe of being *baptized with the Holy Ghoſt*, the *Idea* is eaſily comprehended; 'tis having ſuch a Meaſure of the Power, Grace, and Influence of the *Holy Ghoſt*, as to be as it were *ſurrounded therewith*, or *overwhelmed therein*; and hence we read of *being* and *walking in the Spirit*; and this very well ſuits with the Notion of being *baptized* with the *Holy Ghoſt*.

Again we are inform'd by the ſame worthy Gentleman, that in *Mark* 7. 2, 4. νίπτω *which ſignifies to waſh, and is ſo tranſlated, is explain'd in the Word immediately following, as ſignifying to baptize.* Now, 'tis very natural, for any one to conclude from this Way of arguing, that νίπτω and βαπτίζω are *equivalent Terms*; whereas the former is confin'd moſtly in the New Teſtament (and even in this Paſſage) *to waſh Hands or Feet*, and is never made uſe of in the *Adminiſtration* of the Ordinance of *Baptiſm.* And how juſt it was in the learned Doctor to confound two Words that are applied to diſtinct Uſes and *Ideas*, and to tell us *they explain one another*, I ſhall leave for the equitable Reader to judge.

Again, we are told by the ſame Reverend *Author*, that in *Luke* 11. 38. *It is ſaid, that the Phariſees marvelled that our Saviour had not waſhed before Dinner: The Word in the* Greek *is* ἐβαπτίσθη: To whom he replies, in the following Verſe, *Ye Phariſees make clean the Outſide*, &c. *So that the Word* βαπτίζω *ſignifies there to cleanſe, or to make uſe of the Means of Cleanſing.* To which it may be anſwered, that this is a very uncertain and remote Way of concluding, if not a very dangerous Way of Writing: For immediately after the Scripture Expreſſions, *Ye Phariſees make clean the Outſide*, &c. 'tis remark'd; *So that the Word* βαπτίζω *ſignifies there, to cleanſe.* Whereas the Word is not uſed *there*; 'tis καθαρίζεται. And if any one would be fully ſatisfied, whether the Word *baptizing* may be uſed in the Room of *that Word*, let him apply it in *Mark* 7. 19. and I doubt not he will be perfectly convinc'd.——*And goeth out into the Draught,* καθαρίζον, *purging* (or *baptizing) all Meats.* I have very little more at preſent, to ſay to theſe *Criticiſms*; 'tis the Love I bear to Truth and Juſtice, that prompted me to offer what I have ſaid: And I will venture farther, to declare my free and unreſerved Sentiments, *viz.* That if the great and Reverend Dr. *Owen* were alive, neither his *ſtrict Honour*, nor his *profound Judgment*, nor his *exquiſite* and moſt extenſive *Learning*, would ever ſuffer him to perſiſt in the Defence of *theſe Remarks*, that bear his Name. And the plain Reaſon is eaſily diſcern-

ed,

ed, that in many Inſtances they appear to be not only *beneath*, but *injurious* to, his *diſtinguiſh'd Character.*

2. I come briefly to conſider another Obſervation that the Reverend Dr. *Ridgley* makes in Favour of *Sprinkling*; *viz. That Sprinkling or pouring is ſometimes uſed in Scripture, to ſignify the conferring of thoſe ſpiritual Gifts and Graces which are ſignified in Baptiſm*; --- and *therefore, in a ſpiritual Senſe, Sprinkling is called cleanſing from Sin*; *and the Graces of the Spirit conferred in Regeneration, are repreſented in* Ezek. 26. 25,--27. *by ſprinkling clean Water*, p. 417. I am very ſenſible, that divers *Pædobaptiſts* think, that this is well urg'd, and that it is a good Solution of the Difficulty: But upon a due Reflection, it does not reach the Caſe in Diſpute; for if the Sprinkling under the Ceremonial Law, might interpretatively be underſtood of moral and ſpiritual Cleanſing, that is no Rule why *Baptiſm* ſhould be adminiſtred by *Sprinkling*; ſince the Word *baptizing*, can never be prov'd to ſignify *Sprinkling*: Why then ſhould we be tied down, in the *Mode* of a *Goſpel-Ordinance*, by ſome ſcattered Expreſſions, that are merely alluſive to ſome Practices under the Ceremonial Law. This is a very unjuſt and unſafe Way of arguing: And 'tis very obſervable, that *Cyprian* the zealous *Patron of Sprinkling*, and who ſeems to be the *famous Founder* of it, only pleads for it in Caſes of *abſolute Neceſſity*. He

does not inſiſt that it was, nor ought to be the ordinary Practice of the Church; his Words, in the Paſſages I have already cited, clearly prove this; *Neceſſitate cogente*, Neceſſity compelling, were his Expreſſions. And he makes a manifeſt Diſtinction between Waſhing, and *Sprinkling* or *Pouring*; as when he ſtates the Queſtion put to him, whether they were to be accounted true Chriſtians who had been ſprinkled, *Eò quod non Loti ſint, ſed perfuſi*, becauſe they *had not been waſhed, but perfus'd*, or ſprinkled. And again, he ſays, *it ought not to move or make any Body uneaſy*, *Quod aſpergi vel perfundi videntur ægri*, in that the *Sick are ſprinkled or perfus'd.* And further, he ſpeaks of diſtinct Actions, when he ſays, *Utrumne loti ſint an perfuſi, Whether they be waſhed* or *perfus'd.*

There is no Body who has read *Cyprian*, but muſt allow that he mean't diſtinct *Ideas* by theſe different Terms, and that *Waſhing* and *Sprinkling* were quite different Actions, in his Thoughts. *Waſhing* the whole Body regarded Perſons in their Health, who were baptized in the ſtated Way of the Church, and *Sprinkling* reſpected ſuch as were *Bed-rid*, and for that Reaſon were called *Clinicks.* 'Tis impoſſible, likewiſe, in reading of him, not to obſerve, that he was at a great Loſs what to offer in Defence of Sprinkling; that it was then a novel Practice juſt introduced, or rather introducing, and that pure Neceſſity was the true Mother of that Invention.

3. The

3. The learned Doctor is pleas'd to obſerve, as to the *Greek* Particles, εἰς and ἐκ, which we often render *into* and *out of*; that the former often ſignifies *to*, as well as *into*, and the latter *from*, as well as *out of*; and he gives two Inſtances, *which, in his Judgment, cannot be taken in any other Senſe.* The *former* is *Matth.* 17. 27. wherein our Saviour bids *Peter go to the Sea, and caſt an Hook, and take up the firſt Fiſh that cometh thence.* Where he ſays, *We can underſtand nothing elſe but go to the Sea-ſhore.* I anſwer, this Matter does not ſeem ſo clear, as he would have us believe it to be; nay, it ſeems to be begging the Point in Debate; for there is no Body can prove, that *Peter* went no further than the Sea-ſhore. This was not his uſual Way of Fiſhing; for he and his Partners had a Boat or Veſſel, in which they commonly went out to fiſh, *John* 21. 3. *Simon Peter ſaith unto them, I go a Fiſhing; they ſay unto him, We alſo go with thee. They went forth and entred into a Ship immediately*; there they might make uſe of their *Hooks* and *Nets* to better Advantage perhaps, by caſting them from thence into the Sea, than by ſtanding with an Angling-Rod upon the Sea-ſhore.

The other Inſtance is in the Particle ἐκ, which is rendred *out of*, and is frequently rendred *from*, and we are told, *can be underſtood in no other Senſe*; as when 'tis ſaid, *Luke* 11. 31. *The Queen of the South came from the utmoſt*

Parts of the Earth, to hear the Wiſdom of Solomon, which cannot be underſtood of her coming *out of*, but *from* thence.

I don't ſee, that there is any great Matter in this Remark; for there is No-body ever apprehended, that this Queen ſtarted *from the Bowels of the Earth* of that Country; but that ſhe had liv'd in that *Climate*, trode on the *Ground*, and *walked* in the *ambient Air* of that Country: Nor is there any one that ſuppoſed *Philip* and the *Eunuch* were *all over*, and properly with their *whole Bodies*, at the *Bottom* of that Water, but that they firſt ſtood in it, and that *Philip* put the *whole Body* of the *Eunuch* entirely under the Surface of the Water, ſo that he might be ſaid to be all over covered therewith. And afterwards, they both *went* or *walked out of the Water*, or *from the Water*; for it makes no Difference, which of the two Ways it be rendred; tho' the former is the moſt proper Expreſſion. But the learned Dr. has hit upon as odd a Notion of *coming out of the Water*, as, I think, was ever heard of; when he ſays, *p.* 418. *Where Perſons are ſaid to come up out of the Water, it denotes an Action perform'd with Deſign, and the perfect Exerciſe of the Underſtanding in him that does it; which ſeems not agreeable to one who is at the Bottom of the Water, and can't well come up from thence, unleſs by the Help of him that baptiz'd him.* Now for this very Reaſon which the Doctor offers himſelf, 'tis probable, that 'tis the firſt Time that this *Motion* was ever called, *Coming out of the Water*; the Scripture never

never calls it ſo, that I know of: For in ſtrict Propriety of Speech, and good Senſe, this Part which we are ſpeaking of *(emerging)* ſhould be called *Riſing*, or being *rais'd out of the Water*. Accordingly, St. *Ambroſe* calls it, *Reſurgimur*, *reſuſcitamur*, i. e. we are *riſen*, or *rais'd* again. But then, it is eaſy to conceive, that when a Perſon has been thus *rais'd*, and plac'd upon his Legs after his Baptiſm, he may make uſe of his Underſtanding, in *going* or *walking up out of the Water*. Dr. *Hammond* was ſo well ſatisfied in this, that when ſpeaking of the Baptiſm of our Lord, he ſays, *He went out of the Water before John*. And 'tis very natural to conceive thus of this Affair: For the *Adminiſtrater* is commonly the *firſt* who goes *into*, and the *laſt* who comes *out of* the Water, in performing the Ordinance of Baptiſm. I obſerve further, that the worthy Dr. *Ridgley* repeats the Term, *Bottom of the Water*, in this Diſpute. There is no great need for this *Phraſe*; for we never deſire to put Perſons to the *Bottom* of the *Font*, but only under the *Surface of the Water*, ſo as that their Bodies may be *once* covered *all over*, and then they are immediately *rais'd up*, and this is ſufficient to anſwer the End of the Ordinance.

What he ſays, *p.* 418. of the *Pſalmiſt*, ſpeaking of *them going down to the Sea in Ships*, he does not mean *them to go to the Bottom of it: Therefore going down in the Water, does not always ſignify being plung'd in it*. I anſwer, in my Opinion, this Inſtance had better been let alone,

for it will manifeſtly turn againſt him; for a Ship when firſt launch'd, enters directly ſeveral Feet deep into the Water, continues ſo the Courſe of the Voyage, and often touches the Bottom upon Rocks, Shelves, Sands or Banks; and in tempeſtuous Weather, is frequently ſurrounded with *Seas*, running and rolling Mountains-high above it; and if, thro' Mercy, the poor Mariners are ſaved, yet any experienc'd *Sailors* will inform us, that 'tis common for ſuch Waves to paſs over the whole Body of the Ship, and all that's contain'd in it, and entirely to cover it for a ſhort Space. This is not the leaſt of *the Wonders of the Lord in the Deep*, ſeen by them *who go down to the Sea in Ships, that do Buſineſs in great Waters.* Pſalm 107. 23.

But I am very ſenſible, that the Aim of the learned Doctor, is to perſuade us, that the *Adminiſtrators* and the Perſons to be baptiz'd, *did not go into the Water*, leſt it be concluded, that the baptiz'd Party was *dip'd*; but only, that they went to the Water-ſide, and ſo Sprinkling might be perform'd upon the Dry-land, cloſe by the Water-Side. I anſwer, if for Argument Sake we lay aſide the Signification of the Word βαπτίζω in this Caſe, yet it appears, that the Perſons baptiz'd were actually in the River *Jordan.* Thus it is ſaid, *They were baptiz'd of him (ἐν) in Jordan, confeſſing their Sins.* What Occaſion was there of going into the River to be ſprinkled? Would not a Baſon or a Cup do as well, to take a little Water up, to ſprinkle

ſprinkle them with? And then the Account ſhould run thus, and *he ſprinkled them upon the Banks of Jordan, with ſome Water taken out of the River.* This would be the true Relation, but what a ſtrange Alteration would it make in the Hiſtory of the Goſpel? Again, if we conſider the Caſe of our *Saviour's Baptiſm, Mark* 1. 9. 'tis ſaid, *he was baptiz'd* (εἰς) *to* or *into Jordan.* Let the worthy Doctor tranſlate the Particle in his own Way, he was ſprinkled *to Jordan,* I am ſure 'tis no good Senſe. But let it be rendred, he was *dip'd* into *Jordan,* 'twill make a true grammatical Tranſlation, and clear current Senſe.

Farther, to put it beyond any Scruple, as to the Spot upon which *John* perform'd his Office, we are aſſur'd 'twas *in the River Jordan*; not upon any Bank or Plain, or Field adjacent to it, but in the River itſelf; *Mark* 1. 5. *and were all baptiz'd of him in the River Jordan.* I don't ſee how 'tis poſſible for any Thing to add to the Strengeh of this Evidence, unleſs it were ocular Demonſtration. 'Twas neceſſary, I think, for *John* and the Perſons baptiz'd, *to go into the Water,* or elſe it could not be ſaid, that the Thing was done *in the River.* And hence it appears, that the learn'd Doctor's critical Obſervation is of no Weight; for 'tis evident, that the People to be baptiz'd, went not only *to,* but *into,* the Water; and went not only *from it,* but *out of* it; we urge therefore juſtly, according to the Meaning of the Word, and the Circumſtances of the Hiſtory, that they were

were *dip'd*; but 'tis his Part to prove that they were only ſprinkled in the River.

As to what he offers, *p.* 419. *That it does not ſufficiently appear to him, that* Ænon *afforded Water deep enough to be baptiz'd after this Manner* (of Immerſion) *for it ſeems to be a ſmall Tract of Land*, &c. I anſwer, that this Way of arguing is both unſatisfactory and inſignificant; for every one, who underſtands the Situation of Grounds, knows, that the ſmalleſt Field, or Incloſure belonging to a large Tract of Land, may have the beſt and moſt capacious Spring, Pool, Pond or Lake in it, or Rivulet paſſing thro' it, of any Part of that Land.

Of the ſame Sort, is, what he adds a little lower, *viz. If there had been a great Collection of Waters there, there would have been Indications thereof at this Day*, &c. And I anſwer, 'tis very rational to conclude, that the like Waters remain there to this Day; has any living Perſon of Veracity been there to examine the Matter? let him prove the contrary. What ſignify precarious Conjectures and Suppoſitions, made in direct Contradiction to plain Scripture-hiſtory? Which latter, we deſire for ever cloſely to adhere to. And the learned Doctor may eaſily ſee, that the Phraſe, *many Waters*, intends a great Collection of Waters, in many Places of the Scriptures, as *Pſalm* 93. 4. *The Lord on high is mightier than the Noiſe of many Waters, Sept.* ὕδατων πολλῶν. *Rev.* 1. 15. *and his Voice as the Sound of many Waters,* ὕδατων πολλῶν Chap. 14. 2. *And I heard a*

Voice

Voice from Heaven, as the Voice of many Waters, ὕδατων πολλῶν Chap. 19. 6. *And I heard as it were the Voice of a great Multitude, and as the Voice of many Waters,* ὕδατων πολλῶν Let any Man of common Senſe judge, whether theſe Places do not mean, a *Collection of many Waters.*

Again, when *Solomon* ſays, *Cant.* 8. 7. *Many Waters can't quench Love,* מים רבים. The *Septuagint* render the Words in the ſingular Number ὕδωρ πολὺ i. e. *much Water,* or a *great Quantity of Water cannot do it*: 'Tis plain, that this was the Meaning of the Paſſage; and indeed ὕδατα πολλὰ ſeems to be a mere *Hebraiſm,* expreſſing *many Waters,* but intending *much Water.* And in this Senſe, 'tis evident, that *John* repair'd to *Ænon,* becauſe there was *much Water,* fit for his Purpoſe, to baptize Perſons therein, by *dipping* them. But 'tis very remarkable, that the Epithet πολὺ is not only applied to an ordinary Collection of Waters, but to πέλαγος, the *Sea itſelf*; which ſhews the Uſage of the Phraſe to denote *much Water,* in Quantity. Thus the Poet is introduced by * *Grotius,* ſaying, *The Fire* (the Torch) *of Love is eternal, it cannot be extinguiſh'd by the great* (much) *Sea, in which it was born.*

---

* Πυρσὸς ἔρωτος ἀεὶ αἰώνιος, ἐσβέσθη δὲ
Οὐδὲ τὸτ' ἐν πολλῷ τιτλόμενος πελάγει.
Antipat. apud Grot. in Cant. 8. 7.

As

As to what the learned Doctor and others inſiſt upon, in regard to the Scarcity of Water in the Land of *Canaan*, I have conſidered it elſewhere; But if this Argument was allowed him in its full Force, it will turn againſt him; for it may be anſwered, that Water was not ſcarce in *Jordan* and in *Ænon*, there was Plenty of it there: 'Twas for this very reaſon, that *John* came to *Jordan* and *Ænon*, that he might have ſufficient Depth of Water in order to dip the Perſons to be baptiz'd.

There is but one Thing more that I ſhall take Notice of, as urg'd by the Reverend Doctor, *p.* 420. *viz. That it does not ſufficiently appear to him*, that *John* uſed *Immerſion* in Baptiſm, *in as much as there was no Conveniency for Change of their Garments, nor Servants appointed to help them therein.* To which I anſwer, 1. That it was not particularly told us in the Old Teſtament, that they put off their Cloaths everyTime they bath'd themſelves; and yet 'tis certain they did put them off in that Ceremony; for they were commanded *to waſh their Cloaths* as well as to *bathe their Fleſh.* So they muſt of Courſe have put on other Cloaths in the mean time, *Lev.* 15. 8, 11, 13. And in the Caſe of *Naaman* the *Syrian* 2 *Kings* 5. When he dip'd himſelf ſeven Times in *Jordan*, there is no mention of his *putting off*, and *putting on* his Cloaths, and yet there is no doubt but theſe Actions were perform'd.

2. I don't think the New Teſtament is ſo ſilent about this Matter, as the learned Doctor imagines it to be. Theſe Phraſes, *Putting off the old Man, and putting on the new, and put-on Chriſt*, are perhaps beſt underſtood as referring to this Cuſtom of uncloathing and cloathing again at Baptiſm.

And ſome very great Men, and * Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* in particular, thought that the *Apoſtle* alludes to this Practice in ſeveral Paſſages of his Writings. And † Dr. *Burnet*, late Biſhop of *Sarum*, ſays, that when Perſons were baptiz'd, they had *no other Garments*, but what might cover Nature.

3. Divers of the ancient Fathers mention this Cuſtom in the moſt open and clear Manner. As St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Ambroſe*, and *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*. I would urge here their naked Teſtimonies, but that I think they are better repreſented by that excellent Gentleman || Mr. *Bingham*. His Words are theſe; --- " The " Ancients thought, that Immerſion or bury-" ing under Water, did more lively repreſent the " Death and Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, " as well as our own Death unto Sin, and ri-" ſing again unto Righteouſneſs; and the di-" veſting or uncloathing of the Perſon to be " baptiz'd, did alſo repreſent the putting off " the Body of Sin, in order to *put on the new*

* On 2 Tim. 2. 19. † Exp. 27th Artic. || Origin. Eccleſiaſt. Vol. 1. p. 521.

" *Man*

" *Man, which is created in Righteouſneſs, and* " *true Holineſs:* For which Reaſon they ob- " ſerv'd the Way of baptizing all Perſons na- " ked and diveſted, by a total Immerſion un- " der Water, except in ſome particular Caſes " of great Exigency, *&c.* ---- That Perſons were " diveſted in order to be baptiz'd, is evident " from expreſs Teſtimonies which affirm it; " and alſo from the Manner of baptizing by " Immerſion, which neceſſarily preſuppoſes it.

And having given the Teſtimonies of St. *Chryſoſtom*, and St. *Ambroſe*, he ſays, " That " *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* takes Notice of this Cir- " cumſtance, together with the Reaſons of it, " when he thus addreſſes himſelf to Perſons " newly baptiz'd: *As ſoon as ye came in to the* " *inner Part of the Baptiſtery, ye put off your* " *Cloaths, which is an Emblem of putting off* " *the Old Man with his Deeds.*

So alſo *Amphilochius* in the Life of St. *Baſil*, ſpeaking of his Baptiſm, ſays, " *He aroſe with* " *Fear, and put off his Cloaths, and with them* " *the Old Man.*

The ſame learned Writer adds, " That no " Indecency might appear in ſo ſacred an Ac- " tion, two Things were eſpecially provided " for by ancient Rules. 1. That Men and " Women were baptiz'd a-part; to which Pur- " poſe the Baptiſteries were commonly divided " into two Apartments, the one for the Men, " the other for the Women. 2. There was an- " ciently an Order of Deaconeſſes in the Church, " and one main Part of their Buſineſs was to

" aſſiſt

" aſſiſt at the Baptiſm of Women; where for " Decency's Sake they were employed to di- " veſt them; and ſo to order the Matter, that " the whole Ceremony both of Unction and " baptizing might be perform'd in ſuch a Man- " ner, as became the Reverence that was due " to ſo ſacred an Action. --- Perſons thus di- " veſted or uncloath'd were uſually baptiz'd " by Immerſion or *Dipping* of their whole " Bodies under Water, ---- there are a great " many Paſſages in the *Epiſtles* of St. *Paul*, " which plainly refer to this Cuſtom; and as " this was the *original Apoſtolical* Practice, ſo " it continued to be the *univerſal* Practice of " the Church for many Ages. *

Farther this learned and Reverend Author, takes Notice of the proper Garments for Miniſters, and for the Perſons baptiz'd, being reſerv'd in the Baptiſteries for that Uſe; thus, ſpeaking of the Ornaments of thoſe Places, he ſays, " If the Garments of the Miniſters " baptizing, or the white Robes of Perſons " newly baptized, which were reſerv'd in theſe " Baptiſteries as Monuments and Tokens of " their Profeſſion, may be reckon'd Ornaments " of theſe Places, the Baptiſteries had always " theſe Things from their firſt Erection. And in another Place, ſpeaking of the ancient Cuſtoms of Cloathing the newly baptiz'd in *white Garments*, he adds, " Theſe Garments were

* Ibid. p. 522.

" commonly

" commonly worn eight Days, and then laid " up in the Church. St. *Auguſtine*, or ſome " one under his Name, ſpeaks of the *Sunday* " after *Eaſter*, as the Time appointed for this " Purpoſe. That was the Concluſion of the " *Paſchal Feſtival*, and then the *Neophytes* " chang'd their Habit; whence that Day is " thought to have the Name of *Dominica in* " *Albis:* And *White-ſunday* is ſaid to be ſo " called from this Cuſtom of wearing *white* " *Robes* after Baptiſm. *

As I have no Inclination, ſo I am not obliged to defend theſe circumſtantial Ceremonies of the primitive Chriſtians; 'tis ſufficient to my Purpoſe, that they baptiz'd by *Immerſion*, and that there was Change of Garments, or diveſting and cloathing again at the Adminiſtration of this Ordinance. Nor is there any Manner of Need to add more Teſtimonies to prove this Point. Therefore I conclude, that whoſoever will take upon him to diſprove *Dipping* to have been the Practice of the primitive *Chriſtian Church*, will have a very hard Task of it; for he muſt oppoſe the moſt *natural Senſe* of the *New Teſtament*, he muſt diſown the loud, unanimous and clear Voice of all Antiquity, and he muſt ſtiffly ſide with a modern Sort of Writers, who, at all Hazards, attempt to defend *ſprinkling*, which indeed is indefenſible,

* Ibid. p. 310. 541.

and

and à Thing not known, till within theſe two laſt Centuries, in theſe Nations.

Upon the whole, Baptiſm was left by the Apoſtles to reſt on the explicit Authority of *Chriſt*, to be adminiſtred to thoſe only, who ſhould be diſciple by Inſtruction. If it had been deſigned that the Infants of Converts from *Judaiſm* or *Heatheniſm*, ſhould be baptiz'd, the Scriptures would have told us ſo: And there were many Thouſands of ſuch Converts in the Time of the *Apoſtles*, if the Holy Ghoſt had thought fit to give us any ſuch Notice. But it is paſſed over in deep Silence: And where there is no Revelation, there is no Authority to act in inſtituted Worſhip. Therefore *Pædobaptiſm* muſt be either abſolutely *de jure humano*, or mere Gueſs-work at beſt; and yet this Practice by Degrees, has found means to juſtle out, the only Baptiſm our *Lord* ever inſtituted (that upon Profeſſion) and got the quiet Poſſeſſion in its Place: How this Exchange will be accounted for, without any Licence or Intimation from the *Law-giver*, I can't diſcern.

As for *Sprinkling*, 'tis well known it was contriv'd in Caſes of great Exigency, to ſupply the Room of the true Method, by Way of *Diſpenſation* or *Courteſy*. But ſtrictly ſpeaking, it cannot be called *Baptiſm* in a *literal, ſcriptural*, nor yet in an *Eccleſiaſtical* Senſe: for it never received ſo much as the Sanction of a general *Council*; but it has unaccountably crept into Faſhion in theſe latter Ages, contrary to

the *Rubrick* of the *Church* of *England* in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and the Rules of all Antiquity. I cloſe with the Words of the late learn'd Dr. *Whitby*, on *Rom.* 6. 4. Speaking of *being buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm*, he ſays, "And this *Immerſion* being religiouſly obſerv-
"ed by all *Chriſtians* for *Thirteen Centuries*,
"and approved by our *Church*, and the Change
"of it into *Sprinkling*, even without any Al-
"lowance from the *Author* of this *Inſtitution*,
"or any Licence from any *Council* of the
"*Church*, being that which the *Romaniſt* ſtill
"urgeth, to juſtify his Refuſal of the *Cup* to
"the *Laity*. It were to be wiſh'd, that this
"Cuſtom might be again of general Uſe, and
"*Aſperſion* only permitted as of old, in Caſe
"of the *Clinici*, or in preſent Danger of Death.

FINIS.

---

9 MR 70

ERRATA.

PAGE 224, Line 2, read *Gentleman*. P. 205. Line 11. r. *Gentleman*. P. 207. L. 19. r. *Aanabaptiſts*. Ibid. L. 24. r. *Pædobaptiſt*.